LIBRARY OF
Union Biblical Seminary

Presented by

Purchased by

221.15
Sch 82
#813

Bonebrake Seminary

OLD TESTAMENT THEOLOGY.

PRINTED BY MORRISON AND GIBB,

FOR

T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH.

LONDON: SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, HAMILTON, KENT, AND CO. LIMITED.

NEW YORK: CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS.

TORONTO: THE PRESBYTERIAN NEWS CO.

Old Testament Theology.

THE RELIGION OF REVELATION

IN ITS

PRE-CHRISTIAN STAGE OF DEVELOPMENT.

BY

DR. HERMANN SCHULTZ,

PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF GÖTTINGEN.

Translated from the Fourth German Edition

BY THE

REV. J. A. PATERSON, M.A. OXON.,

PROFESSOR OF HEBREW AND OLD TESTAMENT LITERATURE IN THE UNITED PRESBYTERIAN COLLEGE, EDINBURGH.

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. II.

EDINBURGH:

T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.

1892.

LIBRARY OF
Bonebrake Theological Seminary
BS
1174
.S3
v.2
813.

[*The Translation is Copyright by arrangement with the Author.*]

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

SECOND MAIN DIVISION.

ISRAEL'S CONSCIOUSNESS OF SALVATION AND RELIGIOUS VIEW OF THE WORLD, THE PRODUCT OF THE RELIGIOUS HISTORY OF THE PEOPLE.

A.—The Consciousness of Salvation.

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	The Covenant,	1–21
II.	The Character of Israel's Consciousness of Salvation: Righteousness, Grace, Faith, Law,	21–46
III.	The Holiness of the People in regard to Religious and Moral Acts: Decalogue, Motives of Morality, Growth of Morality,	46–65
IV.	The Holiness of the People in regard to the Outward Form of Existence: Origin and Development of the Ceremonial Law,	65–78
V.	The Religious Blessedness of the Israelites: Blessedness and Wisdom,	79–86
VI.	The Old Testament Doctrine of Atonement: Possibility, Means, and Conditions of Atonement,	87–100

B.—The Religious View of the World.

(*a*) *God and the World.*

VII.	The Spiritual Personal God of Israel,	100–116
VIII.	Revelation and Names of God,	116–141
IX.	The Being and Attributes of God,	142–179
X.	Creation and Providence: Creation and Preservation, Miracles, Free-Will, Doubts, Theodicy,	180–213
XI.	The Angels: History of the Idea, Elohim, Malach, Classes of Angels, Cherubim, Seraphim,	214–241

(b) Doctrine of Man and of Sin.

CHAPTER — PAGE

XII. Man: Man as a Natural Being, Special Dignity of Man, Original Condition, Everlasting Life, . . . 241–269

XIII. Evil outside of Humanity: Origin, Development, and Completion of the Doctrine anent Evil Spirits, . . 269–280

XIV. Manifestation and Names of Sin in Israel: Development of the Doctrine of Sin; Stages, Climax, and Essence of Sin, ... 281–291

XV. The Universality of Sin and its Origin, . . 292–306

XVI. Guilt and Death, ... 306–320

XVII. The Condition after Death, ... 320–332

(c) The Hope of Israel.

XVIII. The Outlook of the Mosaic Age for a Complete Salvation: Blessing of Jacob, Davidic Hopes, Prophecies in B, C, Actual Prophecies, ... 333–353

The Hope of the Prophetic Period.

(a) Future Salvation as an Act of God.

XIX. The Divine Advent and the Day of the Lord: The Day of the Lord, Judgment, Deliverance, . . 354–364

XX. The Last Age and its Blessings, ... 364–373

XXI. The Heathen Nations in the Last Days: The Heathen as the Enemies of Israel, the Heathen as Non-Israelites, 373–382

XXII. The Resurrection, ... 382–398

(b) The Human Instruments for Establishing the Kingdom of God.

XXIII. The Davidic Kingdom in the Last Age, . . . 399–424

XXIV. Supplementary Features of the Messianic Picture: Prophet, Priest, Suffering Servant of Jehovah, . 424–437

XXV. Messianic Prophecy as Developed by the Scribes, Apocalypses: Double Sense of Scripture, . . 437–450

Index of Subjects, ... 451–456

Index of Hebrew Words and Phrases, ... 457–465

Index of Texts, ... 466–470

SECOND MAIN DIVISION.

ISRAEL'S CONSCIOUSNESS OF SALVATION AND RELIGIOUS VIEW OF THE WORLD, THE PRODUCT OF THE RELIGIOUS HISTORY OF THE PEOPLE.

A.—*THE CONSCIOUSNESS OF SALVATION.*

CHAPTER I.

THE COVENANT.

LITERATURE.—J. L. Saalschütz, *Das mosaische Recht nebst den vervollständigenden talmudisch-rabbinischen Bestimmungen*, 2nd ed. 1853, 1, 2. J. E. Cellerier, *Esprit de la legislation mosaïque*, Gen. Par. 1837, 1, 2. For the idea of the theocracy, see the works of Spencer, Blechschmid, Deyling, Goodwin, Hulsius, Dannhauer, Conring in Blas. Ugolinus, *Thesaurus antiquitatum sacrarum*, vol. xxiv. Hermannus Guthe, *De foederis notione Jeremiania*, Lipsiae 1877.

1. In every healthy period of their existence since Moses made them a nation, the Israelites enjoyed a consciousness of salvation so vivid and strong as to render them certain of their national vocation, and give them the instinct and the power to mould their religious and moral inheritance into ever new and higher forms. This consciousness, to which the prophets gave a purely spiritual form, may be best and most clearly described, in the phraseology generally used since the eighth century, as an assurance of being in covenant relation-

ship with the living God. A true fellowship with God which is not merely to hover before the eyes of men as an ideal picture, sketched by a hopeful fancy, but is to be an actual possession, can be experienced only when God Himself enters into fellowship with men, qualifies them properly for His service, awakens in them the sense of divine favour and of a worthy existence, and moulds their lives into forms which can, at least in idea, embody the divine life. That this has happened in the case of the Israelitish people the piety of Israel takes for granted, and the relationship thus produced is described as a covenant between God and the people.[1]

The expression is in strict accordance with the ordinary idiom. The making,[2] establishing,[3] or concluding[4] of a covenant, is, in the simple circumstances of the ancient East, the foundation of all legal relations. Even yet among the independent tribes of the Syro-Arabian deserts every legal arrangement rests on a special voluntary agreement or covenant; and we must picture to ourselves the circumstances of Israel's early age as precisely the same. When two tribes are anxious to remain at peace and to respect each other's possessions, and desire intermarriage and commercial intercourse, they conclude a covenant.[5] The election of a king is a covenant between the person chosen and the people.[6] Heads of clans bind themselves to certain duties by enter-

[1] ברית. [2] נתן ברית.

[3] הקים ברית, which means not merely to hold upright, but also to set upright, to set up. Both expressions are found in A (Gen. vi. 18, ix. 9, 11, xvii. 2, 19, 21).

[4] כרת ברית, ὅρκια τέμνειν, from the custom, to be described immediately, of cutting the victims into pieces (in B, Gen. xv. 18), usually with עם or את, in the time of the Exile with ל, by which, perhaps, the efficiency of God's work is more strongly emphasised than the reciprocal character of the contract (Jer. xxxii. 40; Ezek. xxxiv. 25; B. J. lv. 3, lxi. 8).

[5] Gen. xxi. 32, xxxiv. 15 f.; Josh. ix. 6, 7, 11, 16 (15); 1 Sam. xi. 1; cf. Judg. iii. 6, iv. 17. Thus in Ex. xxiii. 32, xxxiv. 12, they are forbidden to make a covenant with Canaan and its idols.

[6] 2 Sam. iii. 12, 21, v. 3.

ing into a covenant.[1] Special friends swear to treat each other as brothers.[2] Those who have taken an oath to rebel are under a covenant.[3] Thus the word can be naturally used as a metaphor far beyond its original limits. Religious poetry speaks of a covenant with one's own eyes,[4] with the stones and the beasts of the field, with leviathan.[5] By A, who takes a special delight in living in this circle of thought, the revenue of the priests, like every individual duty as well as every privilege included within the great covenant, is described as an "everlasting covenant of salt."[6] Even the law of God in nature is called, in the language of the prophets, a covenant with her.[7]

Such covenant contracts were undoubtedly accompanied since the earliest days by certain solemn acts, as, for example, by a common sacrificial meal,[8] at which some of the victim's blood was sprinkled on those entering into the covenant as a sacred means of consecration and union,[9] or by the eating of salt, which is used even in our own day to ratify a covenant.[10] The most detailed description of such a solemnity is given by Jeremiah,[11] when he tells how the people solemnly pledged themselves in the temple of God to let their Hebrew slaves go free. This passage at once illustrates and explains Gen. xv. 8 ff. The central feature of the ceremony is a symbolical oath. The animals sacrificed are divided, and the two halves placed opposite to each other. Then the parties to the covenant walk between them, and call down on their own heads the fate of these victims, should they ever violate their covenant obligations. The two halves cannot by any possibility represent the two parties entering into the cove-

[1] Gen. xiv. 13, בעלי־ברית.
[2] 1 Sam. xviii. 3 ff., xx. 8, 16, 42, xxiii. 16 ff.
[3] 2 Kings xi. 4. [4] Job xxxi. 1. [5] Job v. 23, xl. 28.
[6] Num. xviii. 19, xxv. 12; Lev. xxiv. 8. [7] Jer. xxxiii. 20, 25.
[8] Gen. xxxi. 46, 54. [9] Ex. xxiv. 8, דם־הברית.
[10] Num. xviii. 19; 2 Chron. xiii. 5, ברית־מלח; cf. Lev. ii. 13, "Neither shall the salt of the covenant of thy God be lacking from thy meat-offering."
[11] Jer. xxxiv. 8, 18.

nant, whom God, the real maker of the covenant, by passing between them as a flame, unites. In Gen. xv. God is Himself one of the contracting parties, and in the passage in Jeremiah no flame passes along between the two halves of the sacrifice. It is simply a form of oath, like the symbolical sending out of dismembered bodies or animals sacrificed, by which the curse of a like destruction was called down upon the heads of the laggards.[1] In fact, a covenant and an oath are not in origin essentially different. Even that old form of oath, the sacrificing of seven victims as witnesses to the oath, from which the word נִשְׁבַּע is derived, is quite akin.[2]

A covenant is concluded on the basis of certain conditions, these being termed "the words of the covenant."[3] In so far as these are written down, they are called the tables, or book of the covenant.[4] And in many cases the covenant had probably also a definite outward token—the sign of the covenant. At least we shall find instances of this in the course of our investigation.

The idea that even God's relationship to Israel rested on a covenant was so deeply rooted that Josiah the king, grounding his action on Deuteronomy, entered anew into a covenant with Jehovah;[5] and Jeremiah the prophet also regards the complete attainment of salvation as a new covenant which God wishes to make, though in a new way, with His people.[6] Wellhausen is right in looking at the sacrificial feast itself as a "covenant" between God and man.[7]

2. To a relationship of mutual agreement between God and the people is also referred whatever present and future

[1] Judg. xix. 29; 1 Sam. xi. 7; *Iliad*, iii. 298.

[2] Gen. xxi. 28, cf. 23 f., 27, 32 (31 נִשְׁבַּע), xxvi. 28, where אלה and ברית are interchangeable. Cf. also Judg. ii. 15; Ps. lxxxix. 4.

[3] Ex. xxiv. 7 f., xxxiv. 27.

[4] Ex. xxiv. 7, xxxi. 18, xxxiv. 29; Deut. ix. 9.

[5] 2 Kings xxiii. 3. [6] Jer. xxxi. 31 ff. [7] *L.c.* p. 72 f.

salvation Israel possesses. Certainly the older representations lay greater stress on the idea of "the people of His inheritance." But already in C and its sources the thought of a covenant is both clear and significant. Now this involves the weighty presupposition that, for man as a personal being, there can be no salvation which is not freely received, and which does not also imply certain moral obligations on his part. Man in relation to God is not a being without rights, or one to be treated in an arbitrary way, or merely with lenity. He stands to God in a relation of personal and moral fellowship. Israel as the covenant people is perfectly certain that God will not give free play to His anger, but will punish in accordance with fixed principles of right and equity. Hence, also, this religion can work out that conception of righteousness which we shall have to describe at a later stage.[1] This is in no sense a claim on the part of man to be really equal with God. Even the victor makes with the vanquished a covenant—to spare him.[2] The term can also be applied where the position of the two parties is utterly unequal, where pure mercy and love is on the one side the condition of the relationship. But, as soon as a covenant is formed, there comes into existence a certain relation of equality, a mutual obligation. Thus, according to the narrative of B, on account of His covenant relation with Abraham, God is unwilling to hide from him important decisions, such as the judgment against Sodom.[3] To put it more generally, the covenant-relation makes prophecy a necessity.

In the view of a pious Israelite, the real covenant on which Israel's relationship to salvation depends, the great covenant which created something absolutely new, is the Covenant of Sinai.[4] God having redeemed Israel, and brought him up out of Egypt by mighty deeds,[5] offered to enter into

[1] Jer. x. 24, xxx. 10 f., xlvi. 28.
[2] Josh. ix. 6 (Ex. xxiii. 32, xxxiv. 15).
[3] Gen. xviii. 17.
[4] Ex. xix. 5 f.; cf. Deut. v. 1, 3.
[5] Ex. xv. 13, 16, xix. 4.

covenant with him,[1] on the ground of this right of His, and of His having proved Himself the God of Salvation; and the people accepted the offer with joyful faith.[2] And notwithstanding the sins of the people, it is renewed, and forms henceforth the permanent basis of all salvation in Israel.[3] Hence even the legislation of Deuteronomy is not meant to be anything else than a renewal of this covenant.[4]

But it is Israel's firm conviction that this relation of God to His holy people did not begin at that time, but had been entered into from the first with the fathers of the race. The last great history of patriarchal times has, indeed, developed this idea of set purpose and according to a fixed plan. The whole history of the world is treated by A, in his grand and comprehensive scheme, as a history of the rise of salvation in Israel. In fact, creation itself is the establishment of a covenant. The Sabbath, the sign of the covenant between Israel and God, is traced back directly to the act of creation.[5] Next we are told more plainly still of a covenant being entered into with the new race of men that came out of the ark.[6] A covenant is made with them, as confirmation of the blessing at creation,[7] by which, in view of the terrible apprehension of a new flood that might destroy everything, they are guaranteed an uninterrupted existence. The condition of this covenant is to abstain from blood, and to regard human life as sacred.[8] The sign of it is the rainbow, which will remind God of his covenant, and be to men a pledge thereof always new.[9] For the shining of the everlasting light through the waters of heaven is a sign that these waters will never again become an unrestrained flood of judgment, but will give place to a new era of light and mercy. This covenant with mankind is then narrowed down to a special covenant with Abraham, and is thus raised from a natural relation to a

[1] Ex. xix. 3 ff. [2] Ex. xix. 8. [3] Ex. xxxiv. 27 f.
[4] Deut. iv. 1 ff. [5] Ex. xxxi. 13, 16, 17. [6] Gen. vi. 18, ix. 1 ff., 9 ff.
[7] Gen. ix. 1 ff., 7 (i. 27 ff.). [8] Gen ix. 4–7. [9] Gen. ix. 12–17.

moral and religious one.[1] The life of the chosen people is to develop out of the family life of Abraham, as the State grows out of the family. Hence this covenant has a definite national and religious promise.[2] In accordance with A's whole cast of thought, it is true, the moral and religious element is thrown into the background by the Levitical and national Theocratic elements. The inheritance of the land of Canaan and the coming of kings of Abraham's seed are the main points of it. The sign of the covenant is circumcision;[3] the condition of it, pious and moral conduct.[4] This covenant with the patriarchs is then enlarged, by solemn ceremonial, into the covenant of Sinai, into a covenant of God with the people.[5]

But, in point of fact, this view of the connection of Israel's salvation with the patriarchal age is common to all the presentations we have of primitive history. Even B thinks of a relationship of love existing between God and Israel from the very first. He gives the religious and moral import of this relation very great prominence, and in the grandest prophetic style he sketches for it a brilliant future. It is enough to refer to the passages[6] bearing on this. That there is among mankind a family, and later a people, "of whom is salvation," is the direct consequence of God's free love for the ancestors of Israel.

3. By the covenant made at Sinai between Himself and Israel, God brought the people as a whole into a special relationship to Himself, of a religious and moral character. It was just because all the peoples of the world were under His control that God was free to choose a people for special service.[7] He chose the people whose ancestors were already in communion with Him.[8] Thus the God of the whole world became the God of this people.[9] He wills to be their king.

[1] Gen. xviii. 1 ff.; cf. Ex. ii. 24, vi. 4–8.
[2] Gen. xvii. 5–9.
[3] Gen. xvii. 10 ff. (indeed it is itself called ברית in ver. 10).
[4] Gen. xviii. 1.
[5] Ex. xxxiv.
[6] Gen. ix. 26, xii. 2 ff., xv. 7 ff., xxii. 15 ff., etc.
[7] Ex. xix. 5 (כי).
[8] Ex. vi. 4.
[9] Ex. xv. 16, vi. 7, cf. vii. 16, viii. 27, iii. 10.

We hear this special relationship alluded to in numerous turns of thought, in almost every age of Old Testament religion. The consciousness of it, though very elementary, was a bond of union even in Israel's times of greatest confusion. By the men of the Exile this people is afterwards called the assembly, the congregation of God,[1] over which He sits enthroned as prince. But, in the older language, the land of Israel is called God's holy dwelling-place, the mountain of His inheritance,[2] the defiling of which by deeds of wickedness He will Himself avenge, just as He punishes, for example, conjugal infidelity with childlessness. To dwell within it is to be in God's house, "The place, O Lord, which Thou hast made to dwell in; the sanctuary, O Lord, which Thy hands have established."[3] On the other hand, Israel itself is called God's inheritance,[4] His peculiar treasure from among all peoples.[5] The wars of the people against foreign enemies are God's wars.[6] A sin or an injury in Israel gives occasion to the enemies of God to blaspheme.[7] It is God for whose help "among the mighty" the war signal is sent through Israel."[8] It is He who is greeted with the cry that befits a king, "Let Jehovah reign for ever and ever."[9] A curse against Him is high treason.[10] The secular kingdom in Israel appears to the piety of later ages a "rejecting" of God.[11] Every oath in Israel

[1] עדה and קהל, Judg. xx. 2; Num. xxvii. 17, xvi. 3, xx. 4 (for the expressions Lev. viii. 3, 5, ix. 5, xvi. 5, 33; Num. x. 7, xiv. 5; cf. Lev. viii. 4; Num. viii. 9, xvi. 3, xx. 2). Prior to the monarchy the term used will have been "tribes," afterwards "people," and in the Exile "congregation" of Jehovah.

[2] Ex. xv. 17; 1 Sam. xxvi. 19 (Ps. cvi. 38; Num. xxxv. 33; Lev. xx. 5 ff.).

[3] Ex. xv. 18 (Ps. ii. 4 f.).

[4] God's house, Num. xii. 7; His inheritance, 2 Sam. xiv. 16, xx. 19, xxi. 3; 1 Sam. x. 1; especially the expression Ex. xxxiv. 9 (נחלתנו).

[5] Ex. xix. 5, 6.

[6] 1 Sam. xxv. 28. Even a Joab wages his wars in this religious spirit (2 Sam. x. 11, 12).

[7] 2 Sam. 12, 14.

[8] Judg. v. 23.

[9] Ex. xv. 18; cf. Ps. xviii. 47.

[10] Ex. xx. 7; Lev. xxiv. 11 ff.; 1 Kings xxi. 10.

[11] 1 Sam. viii. 6 ff.; Judg. viii. 23.

is an oath by God.[1] Yea, God Himself will in the judgment bring to light what is hidden.[2] Faith in God as the king of Israel is, in the earlier times, connected with a rather material conception of His local presence. Thus the people ask, obviously in reference to the sacred ark, "Is Jehovah in the midst of us or not."[3] In like manner Moses goes up to God and reports to Him as to a sovereign who cannot be approached.[4] But the more consciously developed faith knows only of Israel's special relationship to God, and of his special dignity, just as it knows that God, for Israel's sake, blesses Israel's earthly king.[5] The most beautiful expression for this relationship is the title of son, which God bestows on Israel.[6] Closely akin is the thought of a marriage covenant, of which, both as an explicit metaphor and by way of allusion, the prophets are exceedingly fond.[7]

Thus between God and His people there exists a relation of tenderest love and care, and also of exclusive proprietorship. In every outward distress and inward difficulty God wishes to guide His people by His almighty hand to what is truly best for them. He wishes to make His will known, to give them laws in His wisdom — in a word, to treat them as His peculiar people among the nations of the world. On the other hand, it follows that this whole people dedicates itself, and everything that makes up its national life, to the service of this God. Here a whole people is to be[8] what the priests, who are consecrated to God's service, are elsewhere—a holy people, that is, a people used as God's exclusive property; a people which God sanctifies,[9] that is, prepares for

[1] Ex. xxii. 11; Josh. ii. 12.
[2] Num. v. 18 ff.; Lev. xvii. 10.
[3] Josh. xxii. 31.
[4] Ex. xix. 3, 8, cf. xix. 20, 21, xx, 19.
[5] 2 Sam. vii. 23 f., cf. v. 12.
[6] In B, Ex. iv. 22 f., Israel is merely called God's first-born son. The expression is more exclusive in Deut. i. 31, viii. 5, xxxii. 18; Hos. xi. 1.
[7] Hos. i.–iii.; Jer. ii. 20, iii. 1, 13, xiii. 27; Ezek. xvi.; cf. Ex. xxxiv. 15 f.; Num. xv. 39 (זנה).
[8] Ex. xix. 6; Lev, xi. 44 f., xix. 2; Num. xv. 40.
[9] Lev. xx. 8, 24, xxii. 9, 16, 32; Ex. xv. 16.

His own special use, and which accordingly must be such as to do honour to its God outwardly as well as inwardly—a kingdom of priests. Among this people there must be no priesthood, such as would exclude, from this relationship to God, the rest of the nation as profane. The office of priest merely embodies the honour which belongs to the whole nation as a covenant people. The prophetic period understood it in this way. But certainly in A, in accordance with his priestly tendency, the people's renunciation of priestly holiness and the necessity for a priestly class are emphasised in quite a different manner. This is seen, for example, in the obligation to pay half a shekel apiece as "covering"[1] by way of acknowledging and expiating the unfitness of the people for the service of God, and in the sharp rebuff given to the people when they aspired to equality with the Levites, and to the Levites when they claimed to equal the sons of Aaron.[2]

In its whole national life Israel has to show itself a holy people. That is insisted on with ever-growing definiteness in the various legislative codes. In the two sacraments of the covenant—Circumcision and the Passover—every son of this people is dedicated to God. Life as well as property is regarded as belonging to God. The arrestment of the life on behalf of God is represented in the redemption or sacrifice of the first-born, which A, in his usual style, connects with the substitutionary offering of the tribe of Levi.[3] The dedication of property finds expression in tithes,[4] firstlings,[5] thank-offerings, and votive sacrifices. In like manner, even time, as being God's property, is restored to His service in the Sabbaths and the feast days. On such days the people have

[1] Ex. xxx. 11–16. [2] Num. xvi. xvii.

[3] Ex. xiii. 1, cf. 12 ff., xxii. 29, xxxiv. 19 f.; Num. xviii. 15 ff.; Lev. xxvii. 26; cf. Num. iii. 11, 41, 44, viii. 16 f.; Deut. xv. 19 ff.

[4] Lev. xxvii. 30; Deut. xxvi.

[5] Lev. xxiii. 10, 15 18; Num. xv. 20 f.; cf. Ex. xxiii. 19, xxxiv. 26 (Num. xviii. 12).

to draw near to their king with presents.[1] For this reason there must be no Hebrew slave in Israel. For the Israelites are God's ransomed servants.[2] None of them has at his disposal his own freedom, for that is already God's property. Every seventh year he is to regain the right to dispose of his person. In fact, even money debts are to become invalid on this seventh year.[3] Land cannot be sold in perpetuity. It is only a loan, not a possession. Nothing but its usufruct is transferable by sale.[4] In a word, the Israelites are strangers, sojourners with God.

The individual is primarily regarded as a mere member of his nation. That is quite the ordinary view of antiquity. But in Israel it stands out in special prominence. The law is given to Israel as a people,[5] and even the second law is addressed to Israel.[6] The position and duty of each individual is determined as a matter of course by the character and calling of his people. It is only after Jeremiah and Ezekiel that the moral and religious personality of the individual becomes more prominent. One has just to remain in the surroundings into which one is born. Birth according to the flesh makes a man righteous. That is certainly an imperfect and transitional condition, compared with the religion in which the new birth, according to the Spirit, imparts righteousness; but it is the necessary foundation and preparation for this higher stage.

[1] Ex. xxxiv. 21 ff.

[2] Lev. xxv. 42, 50.

[3] Lev. xxv. 39, 46 (42, 55); Ex. xxi. 2 f.; Deut. xv. 12 ff. (1 ff., שמטה). (Still he can bind himself to constant service.) That an attempt was actually made, in accordance with the Deuteronomic code, to carry out this grand idea, is shown by Jer. xxxiv. 8 ff., and it is at the same time shown that in this form it was then new, and was frustrated by the selfishness of the rich. (2 Kings iv. 1 ff. points to a pretty relentless enforcement of creditors' rights in the olden times.)

[4] Lev. xxv. 13 ff., 23. The jubilee year regulation. How deeply rooted in the national consciousness was the sacred character of a family estate is also shown by Naboth's refusal to sell his family estate (1 Kings xxi. 3 ff.).

[5] Ex. xx. 12.

[6] *E.g.* Deut. vi. 4, xx. 3. Wellhausen is probably right in supposing that the use of the plural of address is always a proof of a later editing of the laws.

Hence the first virtue of a true Israelite is unconditional, reverential, and devoted love to the God to whom his people belongs.[1] In the earlier days this devotion was rather conceived of as a resolute surrender of the whole personality to the God of Israel and to the national peculiarities, as zeal for Jehovah and His people and conscientious adherence to Israel's modes of life. The later ages, especially the post-Deuteronomic, regarded it as something much more inward.[2] The people's most grievous sin, the real violation of the covenant, is committed when they give themselves over to another God. In that case, even though pardon is obtained, the covenant, having been broken, must be renewed.[3] Then God in His wrath gives His people up to punishment, and strengthens other peoples against them.[4] The idolater must die.[5] Every temptation to idolatry must be remorselessly got rid of.[6] Idolatry is whoredom[7]; it is that which is evil in the sight of God.[8] The watchword of the true Israelite is, "For Jehovah."[9]

But the people must not merely hold aloof from other gods. They must feel heartily opposed to the peoples around, and to their usages and customs. Even ancient custom evidently expected this of a true Israelite.[10] The prophets, too, upheld Israel's own customs.[11] Still it was only through A that these became a perfectly organised system.[12] By him Israel's whole worship is given definite and unchangeable forms.

[1] Josh. iv. 24, xxii. 25, 5. Most strongly in Deut. vi. 5, x. 12, xi. 1, 13, 22, xiii. 4, xix. 9, xxx. 16, 20.

[2] Josh. xxiii. 11, xxiv. 14 f., 19–29.

[3] Ex. xxxiv. 10 ff.; cf. 2 Kings xxiii. 3.

[4] Judg. ii. 14, 20, iii. 8, 12, iv. 2, vi. 1; Ezek. vi. 13 f.

[5] Ex. xxii. 20, xxiii. 13; Lev. xvii. 7. [6] Ex. xxiii. 24, etc.

[7] Ex. xxxiv. 15; Lev. xvii. 7, xx. 5; Num. xiv. 33; Judg. ii. 17; 2 Kings ix. 22.

[8] Judg. ii. 11, iv. 1, vi. 1, x. 6, xiii. 1. [9] Judg. vii. 18.

[10] *E.g.* Judg. xix. 12; 1 Sam. xxvi. 19.

[11] Isa. ii. 6 ff., viii. 19; Hos. v. 7, 11 ff.; Jer. xxxv.; Ezek. viii.; Deut. xviii.

[12] Lev. xviii. 1 ff., xx. 26; Ex. xxiii. 32, xxxiv. 11 ff. (Deut. vii. 2).

Aaron's sons die when they offer to the true God unconsecrated incense.[1] In his legislation civil, moral, and ceremonial laws are interlaced in a wonderfully unique fashion. Even what is least is not little, and what is greatest is nothing special. Everything is fixed, peculiar, and cast in a mould of its own. Israel's joys and sorrows, likings and aversions, all receive a peculiar colouring, different from the life of strangers. The Israelite must have the vocation of his people always imprinted on his heart; indeed, he must even have it constantly before his eyes in visible form.[2] Blessedness depends on this holding fast to God; for the righteous see the face of God.[3]

4. This characteristic of Israel's consciousness of salvation causes it to be closely interwoven with its consciousness of nationality, and constitutes what is called *the Particularism of salvation.* It needs no proof that in the olden time exalted religious feeling expressed itself in open antagonism to other peoples, and was thus most closely connected with the warlike spirit of the nation. It is enough to refer to the tone of Deborah's song and to the religious view of the wars of Jehovah. This feature of the religion is by no means lost in later days; and indeed it could not be, for it is closely connected with its historical character. Prophecy is never tired of dwelling on it, and the popular songs of every age keep echoing the thought that Israel possesses unique good fortune in the connection, assigned to it by history, with God's mighty deeds of deliverance. Not with the patriarchs but with the people of Moses did God establish this perfect relationship of salvation, speaking with him face to face, and doing what had never been done since the creation of the world—giving statutes and judgments, in which every one who keeps them finds life.[4]

[1] Lev. x. 1 ff. [2] Num. xv. 37 ff. [3] Ps. xi. 7.

[4] Deut. iv. 7, 21, 32 ff., v. 2–4, vi. 22, vii. 6, 13, 19, 23; Jer. ii. 3, 6, xi. 15 f., xii. 7, 9, xiii. 11, 17; Ezek. xvi. 1 ff., xx. 5 ff., 11, 13, 21; Ps. xix. 8 ff., lxxxix., etc.

Upon this connection of the salvation of the individual with that of the people emphasis is laid with such force that, as has been already said, the individual is taken into consideration by the prophetic Law only as being within the people; in the "Hear thou" of the Deuteronomist all Israel is addressed.[1] The tendency to exaggerate the importance of the individual personality, which is so characteristic of this modern age, is foreign to the whole tone of the Old Testament. The latter never regards the individual as independent of his surroundings, which are not merely the springs of his being but determine its whole direction.

This appears to have been the popular idea of salvation in pre-exilic times. But it does not mean that Israel, considered merely as a mass of human beings and nothing more, was ever regarded by the prophets as an object of divine love. In view of their moral tendency that would be perfectly inconceivable. When it is said, "God is good to Israel," the psalmist adds by way of explanation, "to such as are pure in heart," and he describes a particular moral tendency in Israel as that of the children of God.[2] The pious are God's beloved, "who have made a covenant with Him by sacrifice."[3] It is *Israel, the servant of God*, who alone is concerned with what is said about God's relation with Israel. But Israel is undoubtedly represented as being in quite a unique and exclusive position of favour with God. And in general this means the whole people. God is the Father of the people, "though Abraham knoweth us not, and Israel doth not acknowledge us."[4] He reserved this people for Himself when He assigned to the other nations the host of heaven.[5] For Israel's sake God arranged and guided these peoples. And His honour is closely

[1] Deut. vi. 4, ix. 1, xx. 3, xxvii. 9. In like manner, as Guthe admirably insists, Jeremiah lays special emphasis on the conception of the covenant. Censure and favour are given primarily to the congregation of the people as the party responsible for the covenant.

[2] Ps. lxxiii. 1, 15. [3] Ps. l. 5 (cxvi. 15). [4] B. J. lxiii. 16.

[5] Deut. iv. 7, 19, 20, vii. 6 (a holy people); Ps. cxlvii. 19 f.

bound up with Israel[1] who is a stranger and sojourner with Him.[2] God loved Israel but slighted Esau.[3] The heathen who are at war with the people are God's enemies. Their land is a polluted land.[4] In a word there is no salvation except by means of the fellowship with God which has been bestowed on Israel, in virtue of which He encompasses His people with the same covenant love with which in the days of old He brought them out of Egypt.[5]

It is certainly right, therefore, to ascribe to the pre-exilic period, and especially to the prophetic, a restriction of salvation to Israel—in other words, Particularism. If we here leave out of consideration, as is only fair, philosophical or purely moral development, then in point of fact we must restrict to Israel whatever real religious fellowship there was before the time of Christ with Jehovah, the God who was seeking to found the kingdom of God. No Old Testament saint could, without being false to his own faith, conceive of religious fellowship with Jehovah being possible or even practicable in heathen religions. That this restriction could not last, the prophets were well aware. But that salvation would develop into Universalism remained, in the first instance, a hope for the future. Of course it never occurred to any prophet or saint in Israel to consider all the heathen as individually irreligious and doomed to eternal punishment. A saint before Ezra's time would not even have understood the question involved in such statements.

5. It was only in post-exilic times that national pride made Israel take up a really stiff and arrogant attitude towards the "godless" heathen world. Then, in consequence of the

[1] B. J. xlv. 4, 13; Deut. ix. 28 (Num. xiv. 13). [2] Ps. xxxix. 13.

[3] Certainly first in Malachi, and so out of an age which emphasises these relations in a more one-sided fashion (i. 2, ii. 5, cf. Deut. xxi. 15, xxiv. 3). Elsewhere the positive side at least is expressed just in this way, *e.g.* Ps. xlvii. 5.

[4] Amos vii. 17; Hos. ix. 3; Ps. lxviii. 2 f. (lxvi. 3, 7, lxxiv. 4, 23, lxxxiii. 3).

[5] Deut. xxx. 15 f., xxxiii. 29; Jer. xxi. 8, xxxi. 3; B. J. xl. 10, 27, xli. 8, xliii. 4, 22, xliv. 1, xlv. 4 f., 13, etc.

national hauteur which the keenness of their religious consciousness fostered, and of the energy with which they kept off a hostile world, there grew up a genuine hatred of the foreigner. In the times of living religious progress there were many barriers in the way of an exaggerated national sentiment. Pre-exilic Israel was never very anxious to cut itself off from intercourse with foreign nations. The prophets directed their eloquence much more against the world within Israel than against the world without. And although in the ideal which it hoped for, Israel clung resolutely enough to the thought of becoming a ruling nation, nevertheless it admitted all mankind, in a tolerably large-hearted fashion, to communion with God, and never dreamed of bringing them by force within the pale of Jewish nationality.

It was otherwise in the second Jerusalem.[1] A community had returned home which, so far at least as creed and loyalty to law were concerned, was practically perfect. And although a new purification was soon enough seen to be necessary,[2] still this Israel, at any rate in comparison with the heathen, was quite fit to represent a nation of righteous men. Even on the historical side the incomparable dignity of the people becomes more and more manifest. "Touch not mine anointed, and do my prophets no harm," is the motto of Israel's history.[3] Israel is God's turtle-dove.[4] Israel's land is "the glorious land."[5] The Israelites are the saints of God,[6] and are compared with the host of heaven.[7] For their deliverance the most unheard-of wonders must take place.[8] Their sufferings are simply to try them.[9] To dress up in legendary fashion

[1] Duhm, p. 146. "One must of course distinguish between the natural Particularism of Zachariah and the abstract Particularism of Judaism; for the former is capable of opening out into a higher development, the latter is purposely closed against every new element, and once it has taken up a position it consciously persists in keeping it.

[2] *E.g.* Mal. iii. 1 ff.

[3] Ps. cv. 15 (37); 1 Chron. xvi. 22.

[4] Ps. lxxiv. 1–3, 19.

[5] Dan. viii. 9, xi. 16, 41.

[6] Dan. vii. 18, 21, 25, 27, viii. 24, xii. 7.

[7] Dan. viii. 10.

[8] Dan. i. 16 ff., ii. 25 ff.

[9] Dan. xi. 35, xii. 10 f.

the marvellous success of the Jews among the heathen is a favourite subject of the books of narrative,[1] and with this is connected the endeavour to get the God of Israel acknowledged and glorified even by heathen kings as the Most High God.[2]

And what the people had suffered from the heathen, and what during the course of this period they suffered anew, developed their antagonism to the Gentiles into a bitter passion, such as had at least till then been witnessed only on rare occasions. National pride, and contempt for foreigners fanned this national hatred, this animosity against everything foreign. Non-Israelite began to be synonymous with anti-Israelite. The heathen are God's enemies, a foolish people.[3] God is entreated to pour out His wrath upon the peoples that do not know Him, and to render unto them sevenfold.[4] The land of the heathen is "the strange land where God's song cannot be sung."[5] In all such stories the adversaries of the Jews are brought to ignominy and ruin.[6]

This tendency begins to manifest itself in the age immediately after Ezra. The exaggeration of the national idea led to the Samaritans being refused permission to help in rebuilding the temple.[7] This made the rejected Samaritans "a sect" eager to injure to the utmost the rising community,[8] and objects of such bitter hatred that even the gentle son of Sirach lets it master him.[9] This circumstance has a very marked effect upon the whole tone of Chronicles. Of the northern tribes, under their own national monarchy, it has nothing to relate. For a king of Judah to ally himself with a king of Ephraim is to commit a heinous sin, sure to be immediately

[1] Dan. iv. 5, 6, 15, v. 11, 14, 29, ii. 46, 48; Esth. ix. 1 ff. (2 Macc. ix. 17).
[2] Dan. ii. 47, iii. 26, 28–33, iv. 31–34, 1 ff., vi. 21, 27 ff.
[3] Ps. lxxiv. 10, 18, 22. [4] Ps. lxxix. 6, 12. [5] Ps. cxxxvii. 4.
[6] Dan. iii. 22, vi. 24; Esth. viii. 11 ff., ix. 1 ff., 19 ff.
[7] Ezra iv. 2; Neh. ii. 20. [8] Ezra iv. 2 ff.; Neh. iv. 4 f., ii. 19.
[9] Jes. Sir. l. 26.

followed by misfortune.[1] Amaziah has to disband the hundred thousand men of war whom he had hired out of the northern kingdom, because God has not chosen Ephraim. Elijah writes a threatening letter to Joram because he is acting like the royal house of Israel.[2] This book takes for granted that all Israel proper was again subject to the later kings of Judah, so that the captivity in Babylon included all the twelve tribes.[3] This exaggerated feeling of nationality was also the cause of the foreign women being expelled, which is again historically connected with the growing strength of Samaritanism.[4] While the book of Ruth speaks [5] quite frankly and with admirable affection of the Moabite ancestress of David, in the eyes of Ezra and Nehemiah marriage with women belonging to the neighbouring peoples, the Moabites being expressly included, was like union with the daughters of a strange god,[6] like a pollution of the holy seed. The congregation gets terribly anxious and dreads the very sorest punishment on account of this heinous sin.

There may well have been at the bottom of both these rules a historical necessity, and the proper enough feeling that a perfectly pure people and perfectly pure religious customs had to be established in Israel. All the same it was a decisive step towards the complete separation of Israel as a nation; and the final reason of it was their own fickleness and poverty of spirit which made them

[1] 2 Chron. xx. 35 ff., xxv. 8, xix. 2; cf. 1 Kings xxii. 49 ff.

[2] 2 Chron. xxv. 7 ff., xxi. 11 ff.

[3] 2 Chron. xxx 5, 11, 18, xxxiv. 6, xix. 4; cf. Wellhausen, p. 195 ff.

[4] Ezra ix. 1 ff., x. 1 ff.; Neh. xiii. 23 ff.; cf. Neh. ix. 2, x. 28, 30, xiii. 28–30.

[5] Ruth i. 4, 16, 22, ii. 2, 6, 21, iv. 5, 10, 18–22. Perhaps in the books of Jonah and Ruth we have actually a trace of opposition to the spirit which carried through the reforms of Ezra. For Kuenen is certainly right in thinking that all the elements in Israel cannot have concurred willingly in this new line of action. (In the older legislative code only Canaanitish women are forbidden, not all foreign women without exception, Ex. xxxiv. 11, 16; Deut. vii. 3, xxi. 11 ff.; cf. Num. xii. 1.)

[6] Cf. Mal. ii. 11, 15.

unable longer to admit, in calm self-reliance, any foreign element.

In such songs as Ps. cxxxvii. we see how exaggerated was their hatred of the hostile heathen world, especially of Babylon, of Edom whom God has hated,[1] and later of Syria. In these psalms, doubtless, justifiable indignation against the enemies of God is strongly blended with the glow of human passion.[2] The clearest monument of this disposition is the book of Esther, which is certainly meant to express before everything else the religious conviction that God will protect His own, and bring to nought the wiles of man; but at the same time it shows a depth of revengeful feeling against the enemies of the Jews and "such as sought their hurt,"[3] and against the Amalekite Haman,[4] which is only to be explained by an increasingly one-sided consciousness of national and religious antagonism. Malachi himself lays far stronger emphasis than did former ages, on Edom's permanent rejection, and on God's hatred of this people, and its "border of wickedness."[5] In later times the brunt of indignation naturally falls on the party in Israel itself that is friendly to the heathen, the robbers, those who forget the covenant.[6]

We are thus clearly on the road to "the Judaism that hates humanity." But running alongside of it there is also another road that leads to a world-religion. Many circles show a marked indifference to everything national. This is the case with the Preacher, and especially with the "Greek party" in the wars of Independence. Jesus, the son of

[1] Mal. i. 3.

[2] Vers. 7, 8, 9; cf. cxxxix. 21 f.; Ezra iv. 2; Neh. xiii. 1, iv. 4 ff.

[3] Esth. viii. 11, 13, ix. 1–15 (19–32; cf. Dan. vi. 24).

[4] Esth. viii. 3, 5, iv. 24.

[5] Mal. i. 2–4. His condemnation of marriage with foreign women (ii. 11 ff.) is also striking in view of his admirable tenderness towards the women of Israel (vers. 14 ff.). It is also to be noticed how the kindly attitude of the Deuteronomist to Edom and Moab (ii. 29) gives place in the later historical accounts to quite different views. (Num. xxi. ff.)

[6] Dan. xi. 14, 30, 32; cf. 1 Macc. i. 11–34, ii. 44, iii. 5, 8.

Sirach too, and the book of Wisdom, although neither of them is wanting in vivid expressions of national feeling and pride,[1] are nevertheless, on the whole, getting nearer to the humane views of Universalism. The distinguishing mark of the children of God is not so much descent from Abraham as the being filled with wisdom from above, and with uprightness. And although Philo still holds firmly to the idea that revelation in Israel is the real centre around which salvation develops, and although he hopes for a final glorification of his own people,[2] nevertheless, on the whole, his moral standpoint is of such a character that what is specially Jewish has scarcely any importance attached to it.

But the real strength of the religious development obviously lay in the other direction, viz. in a one-sided emphasising of the national spirit and its antagonism to other nations, and especially to hostile neighbours. In Baruch[3] and the book of Tobit[4] this feeling is strongly marked, but it is still expressed in an Old Testament spirit. The books of the Maccabees give expression throughout to the fierce zeal of a desperate religious war in which, as a matter of course, these feelings of antagonism are intensified.[5] According to the Greek Ezra, the Edomites are already represented as the real destroyers of the temple.[6] According to Enoch, Israel is the best part of mankind,[7] and the children of Israel are spoken of as "the elect."[8] But, above all, the book of Judith shows how relentlessly the hatred of strangers was fostered. The bloody deed at Shechem,[9] though censured in the Old Testament, is for Judith a praiseworthy act against strangers. Simeon and Levi are God's well-beloved

[1] Jes. Sir. xvii. 14 ff., xxxvi. 1. 26; Wisdom of Solomon, xvii.–xix.
[2] Philo, 727, A, B; 824, D; 825, B; 836, C; 910 ff., 930 ff., 937, A.
[3] Bar. iii. 36, iv. 1 ff.
[4] Tob. i. 1 ff., xiii. 6, xiv. 7.
[5] 2 Macc. viii. 32, xi.; 3 Macc. vi. 3 f.
[6] Ezra gr. iv. 35.
[7] Enoch xx. 5 (Michael is set over them).
[8] Enoch xxxviii. 5, xxxix. 6 ff., lxi. 4, etc.
[9] Gen. xxxiv.

sons, zealous for the honour of Jehovah.[1] The heathen, who withstand the race of Israel, are given over to a curse; and indeed it is only from this point of view that the conduct of Judith can be regarded as moral.[2] Achior, the pious heathen, who appears in the book, gets himself circumcised as a proselyte, and is then adopted as one of the chosen people.[3]

This tendency, fostered by the mysterious books, Daniel, Enoch, and Ezra,[4] and embodied most distinctly in Pharisaism, became more and more a national passion, a feeling of contemptuous hatred for all strangers as "godless." The people assumed more and more the *rôle* of a nation hostile to humanity. The wild enthusiasm displayed in the wars against Rome, and the mad fanaticism of the "zealots," are the strongest outbursts of this disposition. What had been in the rude ages of antiquity the natural though rough expression of theocratic feeling became, in these days of high culture, a sentiment artificially fostered, and running directly counter to all the other currents of human development.

CHAPTER II.

THE CHARACTER OF ISRAEL'S CONSCIOUSNESS OF SALVATION.

LITERATURE.—Diestel, "Die Idee der Gerechtigkeit im Alten Testamente" (*Jahrb. f. deutsche Theologie*, 1860, ii. 176 ff.). Hermann Schultz, "Ueber die Gerechtigkeit aus dem Glauben im Alten und Neuen Testamente" (*Jahrb. f. deutsche Theologie*, 1862, 510 ff.). Hofmann, *Schriftbeweis*, i. 581 ff.; A.

[1] Judith ix. 2 ff. [2] Judith xvi. 17. [3] Judith xiv. 6.

[4] In the Psalms of Solomon this sentiment is particularly prominent (vii. 8 f., viii. 41, ix. 16, xii. 7, xiv. 3, xviii. 1 ff. 4). In the Fourth Book of Ezra the passages vi. 55–58, xiii. 39, are to be noted as expressions of a growing anxiety for Israel's purity.

Ortloph, "Ueber den Begriff von צֶדֶק und den wurzelverwandten Wörtern im 2. Th. d. Propheten Jesaiah" (*Zeitsch. f. luth. Theol.* 1860, 401 ff.). Emil Kautzsch, "Ueber die Derivate des Stammes צדק im alttestamentlichen Sprachgebrauche." Tübingen 1881 (*Festschrift*, 6 März).

1. In the earlier writings of the Old Testament no one, who takes into account the general character of the piety described in them, will expect to find any theory as to an Israelite's real relation to God in regard to salvation, that is based either on philosophical self-examination or on theological reflection. The Israelite, who lived according to the ordinances and customs of his people, certainly believed without further doubt in his own "righteousness." But even the prophetic period offers us nothing which in any way reminds us of the terminology of Paul in regard to the righteousness of man before God, or even of that of the scribes in Israel contemporary with him. Peace of conscience is quite frankly based on direct consciousness of fellowship with God. Where human righteousness is spoken of, the word either declares, in regard to a particular case, that the person is in the right, that he has given no reasonable ground for hostility being displayed towards him;[1] or else it is intended to assert that he occupies the right moral and religious standpoint, that he carefully abstains from wickedly transgressing the great ordinances of human and divine justice, and in a word that he is not one of "the evildoers."[2] In this way the writers of the prophetic period speak of "the righteous" as a class of men distinct from the ungodly. They even describe the people of Israel itself by

[1] Gen. xxxviii. 26; 1 Sam. xxiv. 18; 2 Sam. xix. 29, iv. 11; 1 Kings ii. 32; cf. 2 Kings x. 9; Ps. lix. 4 f., cvi. 31. (The idiom in 2 Sam. xix. 29, "What right have I more, *i.e.* wherewith can I justify myself further?")

[2] The opposite of רשׁעים, *e.g.* Gen. xviii. 23, 24, 28, xx. 4, cf. vi. 9, vii. 1; Ps. vii. (4 f.) 9, xviii. 21, 25, xi. 3, 5; 2 Sam. iv. 11. Thus, even in reference to God, it is said quite frankly, Ex. ix. 27, "Jehovah is the צדיק, and I and my people are the רשׁעים," that is, He is right, and we are wrong.

this word, in opposition to the Gentile world and its hostility to the kingdom of God.[1] But generally they contrast the righteous in Israel itself with the wicked. In their mouth the word refers less to a definite relation to particular statutes, than to "goodness and truth," and loyal obedience to God. In the language of the prophets, those Israelites are called righteous who take up a right position to God's revealed will; who, from an honest regard for God and their neighbour, obey, alike in their willing and doing, the divine commandments. Accordingly, during all the time before Ezra, the phrase, a "righteous" man, continued to mean in Israel pretty much the same thing;[2] although of course in the earliest times more value was attached to a blameless following of popular religious customs, while the prophets, on the other hand, are never tired of insisting that the grand principles of morality are the chief condition of righteousness. Hence the use of a great variety of words in practically the same sense, *e.g.* upright, perfect, with clean hands, pious, pure, prudent.[3] Of course, in all cases in which it is a question of divine or human judgment, "to justify" means "to give a formal verdict that the person is innocent, is in the right," never "to effect in him a moral reformation." He is righteous before God who is found to act in conformity with His will.[4] Hence it may also be said that a certain kind of conduct, *e.g.* the

[1] Hab. i. 4, 13; Ezek. vii. 21; Ps. cxviii. 15, 20.

[2] This is proved by passages like x. 2, 3, 6, 11, 20, 24 f. 28, xi. 4, 5, 8, 9 f., xii. 5, 13, 21, 26, 28, xiii. 5, 6, 9, 21 f., xiv. 32, 34, xv. 9, xviii. 10, xxi. 12, 26; Ps. vii. 4.

[3] יָשָׁר, Ps. vii. 11, xi. 2, 7; Prov. xi. 6, xiv. 11. תְּמִים, Ps. xviii. 24, 26; Prov. xi. 5. בְּרֵי־רִים, Ps. xviii. 25. חָסִיד, the meaning of which certainly seems to have oscillated between "he who possesses the attribute חֶסֶד, pius," and "he who experiences the חֶסֶד of God towards himself, the beloved of God" (Ps. xviii. 26, xxxii. 6, cf. iv. 4, xvi. 10, xxx. 5).—נָבָר, Ps. xviii. 27. נָבוֹן, Prov. xvi. 21 (Ps. xxxi. 20, 24, xxxvi. 11, xli. 13, lxiv. 5, 11, xcvii. 11, cxi. 1, cxxv. 4, cxl. 14, cxlix. 1; Prov. ii. 20 f.); cf. Lev. xix. 36 f., where צֶדֶק denotes the right measure in all forms of business.

[4] Ex. xxii. 8, xxiii. 7 f.; 2 Sam. xv. 4; Prov. xvii. 15. Specially characteristic are Isa. v. 23; Job ix. 20, 29, x. 2, 15, xi. 2, xiii. 18, xv. 6, xxvii. 5, xxxii. 3,

faith of Abraham in the divine promise, was accounted unto him for righteousness.[1]

2. Such being the meaning of the word "righteous" it is easily understood that righteousness and sinlessness, in the strict sense, have nothing to do with each other.[2] The Israelite is in a position in which forgiveness of sins and mercy are combined, in which therefore every one who does not give up that position may be called righteous in spite of the sin which springs from human weakness. The same Job whom God calls righteous, and who maintains with the utmost resolution his own righteousness, admits youthful sins.[3] All call themselves, without the slightest hesitation, righteous, who are in earnest in keeping God's commandments, who strive after righteousness, seek God, hold aloof from idolatry, unchastity, oppression, robbery, usury,—in a word from everything which is folly in Israel. Consequently, the men whom the Old Testament terms righteous, and who, in fact, call themselves so in relation to God,[4] are not on that account thought of as free from human weakness or even from heinous sin. The singer of Ps. xxxii. has no hesitation in classing himself with the righteous and godly, and yet a grievous sin had long lain heavy upon him.[5] David is by no means represented as sinless; but he speaks with the utmost confidence of his righteousness, of the cleanness of his

xxxiv. 5, 29; Deut. xxv. 1, B. J. l. 8; 1 Kings viii. 32; 2 Chron. vi. 23; Ps. xxxvii. 33, xciv. 21 (Ps. v. 11 האשים). The purely forensic meaning of הצדיק and הרשיע is for the whole of the Old Testament beyond question. Only in B. J. liii. 11 is the word (construed with ל instead of the Acc.) to be understood as meaning "to make just by reforming" (Dan. xii. 3).

[1] Gen. xv. 6 (חשב). [2] Not till Eccl. vii. 20 is the word so used.

[3] Job i. 1, 8, 22, ii. 3, vi. 10, 29, x. 6, xii. 5, xiii. 23, xvi. 11, 17, xvii. 2, xxiii. 10 ff., xxvii. 2, xlii. 7, cf. vii. 21, x. 14, xiii. 26, xiv. 4 (2 Sam. xiii. 12, 13).

[4] Gen. vi. 9, vii. 1; Ps. vii. 9, xviii. 21, 25 (xvii. 3 f.). For the later period, cf. Deut. vi. 25, xxiv. 13.

[5] This is evident from ver. 6, where from what has happened to himself he draws an inference as to בל־חסיד, cf. Ps. xxxi. 2, 11, xli. 5, 13, xxxviii. 4, 16, 19, xl. 9, 13. The confession in Ps. lxix. 6, 8, might be intended as ironical.

hands.[1] The forgiveness of sin honestly repented of, and expiated according to the divine ordinances, is one of the main principles of the religious consciousness of Israel. Hence, as soon as a sin has been atoned for by repentance, it does not prevent the person being reckoned among the righteous. In their relations with God, such saints trust to this righteousness of theirs, and expect Him to recompense them according to their righteousness, according to the cleanness of their hands;[2] to deliver them in conformity with His righteousness, and not for His mercy's sake. They emphasise their righteousness in a fashion which often pains a Christian, and as to which Lutz says, not without reason, that it is "an impure expression of the consciousness of life by grace."[3] The mercy and the righteousness of God are not represented as at variance with each other. On the contrary, it is impossible to conceive of God being righteous to men without being merciful. Now where there is a covenant, forgiveness of failings not due to an evil will is a constituent part of righteousness. His covenant pledges God to defend those who are true to Him from the assaults of His enemies.[4] But certainly there was wanting in ancient Israel the anxious and unsettling apprehension of personal sin, characteristic of the Levitical period, no less than that deep consciousness of personal guilt and unworthiness which the ideal of true humanity, realised and manifested in Christ, awakens in a Christian. And although in the later period, especially in the last century before the Exile, the mood of joyous self-satisfaction gave place among the better portion of the people to a decidedly penitential frame of mind, nevertheless the consciousness was never altogether lost that, by honest loyalty to

[1] Ps. vii. 9, xviii. 21, 25 (1 Sam. xxvi. 23).

[2] Ps. xviii. 21 ff., 25, cf. 26, 31; Ps. vii. 9, cf. 10; 1 Sam. xxvi. 23; Ps. lxxi. 2, lxxiv. 20; Isa. xxxviii. 3.

[3] Ps. xxvi. 1, 2, 6, 11, xxxv. 24, xli. 13, xliv. 18, 21, cxix. 121; 2 Kings xx. 2 f.; Job xvi. 17.

[4] Ps. liv. 7, lvii, 4.

the divine will, every Israelite can be righteous.[1] Only in the congregation of the second temple does the mood alternate between an over-strained repentance, which is meant, as such, to secure God's favour, and a self-righteousness which is founded on obedience to a purely external form of the divine will.

Thus the Old Testament knows of *an actually present righteousness*. Even in the darkest periods of the national life "a race," a homogeneous society of "righteous" men, is found in contrast with "the wicked" and "the apostate."[2] But, of course, any one who belongs to this society may fall, by his own sin, into the company of evil-doers; and it is befitting the humility of man to pray that God will preserve him from such temptation as would be too strong for human power and might hurry him into positive wickedness.[3] When the God who directs the world justifies a man, He does so by giving him success in life. Consequently, in many of the prophets, especially in the exilic Isaiah, the righteousness which God bestows on men is so spoken of that the word is quite synonymous with "salvation," "help."[4]

3. When we turn to the Old Testament with the grand fundamental question of every religion, "Wherewith is man to obtain the favour of God?" we must expect to get an answer, not so much from particular statements in connection with the word "righteous" as from the general view of the main principles on which the Old Testament salvation is based.

Unquestionably every view of salvation that can be con-

[1] Even in Ps. xviii. 22, we must take "the ways of Jehovah" and "His statutes" in this sense, viz. "to be perfect in relation to Him."

[2] Ps. i. 5 ff., v. 13, xxxi. 19, xxxiii. 1, xxxiv. 16, xxxvii. 16 f., 21, 25, 29, 39, lii. 8, lv. 23, lviii. 11 f., lxiv. 11, lxviii. 4, lxxii. 7, xciv. 21, xcvii. 11, cxxv. 3, cxl. 14, cxlii. 8, cxlvi. 8; Prov. xxv. 26, xxviii. 1, xxix. 7 (Ps. cxix. 63).

[3] Ps. xix. 14, cxxv. 3 (in both cases an entreaty to be preserved from the rule of evil-doers, which brings with it terrible temptation, not from "presumption"), cxli. 3, cxliii. 2; cf. Ezek. iii. 20 f., xviii. 24, 26, xxxiii. 12 f.

[4] B. J. xli. 1, 10, xlii. 21, xlv. 8, li. 5 f., lvi. 1, liv. 14, 17, lvii. 12, lix. 9, 11, lxi. 3, 10, lxii. 1; cf. Micah vi. 5, vii. 9; Ps. lxxi. 15, xxii. 32.

ceived of in Israel must be traced back to the free grace and goodness of God. According to the old book of the covenant, it is God who chooses the people as His people. He has no need of Israel. All the earth is His. Hence, exercising the right of an absolute ruler, He can, of His own free will, choose for Himself His own peculiar people.[1] By His mighty deeds He first ransomed, redeemed, and rescued[2] this people for Himself. He became their Physician.[3] On this mighty act of deliverance the whole relationship of salvation is based.[4] And all who narrate the history of Moses proceed on the conviction that the people in itself was not worthy of such preference.[5] Accordingly, there is no mention anywhere of a salvation due to the merits of the people, to a "righteousness of their own." The proverb still holds, "By strength shall no man prevail."[6] The religious tone of B's narrative gives this conviction the utmost prominence. After the fall Adam, though condemned, is shown mercy both by word and deed.[7] The first mother, in the hour of her sorrow, knows of God the helper.[8] Noah finds grace in the eyes of God.[9] Abraham is called away from his father's house and guided onwards by God. He receives ever higher and higher promises, and hands down the divine favour to his descendants.[10] At last, in Moses, this favour is experienced by the people as the people of God.

Of this mercy of God all the writers speak gladly and

[1] Ex. xix. 5. [2] גאל, קנה, פדה, Ex. xv. 13, 16 (xix. 4).

[3] Ex. xv. 26.

[4] It is in fact to make the people a chosen people (Ex. xx. 2).

[5] *E.g.* Num. xi., xii., xvi., xx., etc. [6] 1 Sam. ii. 9.

[7] Gen. iii. 15, 21.

[8] Gen. iv. 1. (The sentence קניתי איש את־יהוה cannot mean, "I have got a man, Jehovah," as if the mother recognised God in her first-born, or even the Fulfiller of Gen. iii. 15. As little can it mean, "I have got him for Jehovah," as if she had thereby obtained, as it were, a pledge of His favour. It simply means, on the analogy of Micah iii. 8, I have got a man (*i.e.* a man-child on which the mother's joy lays special emphasis) with Jehovah, *i.e.* by the help of Jehovah.

[9] Gen. vi. 8. [10] Gen. xii., xv., xviii. xxii., xxvi., xxviii.

emphatically. "To humble myself before the God who chose me is all too little for me," says David; and in his prayer he extols the exceeding goodness of God.[1] That it was not the might of man but the mercy of God that did the deeds of salvation is often stated with emphasis in the historical narratives. The great mass of the army must be sent home by Gideon, that Israel may not ascribe to its own martial prowess what the wonderful mercy of God achieves.[2] So it is said in the song of Deborah: "Since the rulers rule in Israel, and the people offer themselves willingly, praise ye the Lord;" and "There was neither shield nor sword among forty thousand in Israel."[3] And the royal anthem sings: "Some trust in chariots, and some in horses, but we will make mention of the name of Jehovah our God."[4] God's grace is perfectly free and depends solely on His own being. He has mercy on whomsoever He will,[5] and whosoever is to live, him He writes in His book.[6] Hence, with all the joy which the consciousness of being righteous causes, humility is the key-note of Israel's piety. "I am not worthy of the least of all the mercies, and of all the truth which thou hast showed unto Thy servant."[7]

This humble consciousness of God's mercy meets us equally in all the prophets, from Amos to Zechariah, becoming always clearer and deeper. God chose the people freely, for the fathers' sake, as it runs in Deuteronomy.[8] It pleased Him, for His righteousness' sake,—that is, in order to reveal those statutes of His that bring salvation,[9]—to magnify the law and make it honourable. It was not any special virtue, goodness, or wisdom, in Israel that influenced Him. On the contrary, the people was a sinful people.[10] This is everywhere the

[1] 2 Sam. vi. 21 ff., vii. 18 f., 27.
[2] Judg. vii. 2 ff.
[3] Judg. v. 2, 8; 1 Sam. ii. 9.
[4] Ps. xx. 8.
[5] Ex. xxxiii. 19.
[6] Ex. xxxii. 33.
[7] Gen. xxxii. 10.
[8] Ps. cv. 8 ff.; Deut. vii. 8, ix. 5, 27, iv. 37, x. 14 f., xxxiii. 3.
[9] B. J. xlii. 21.
[10] Deut. vii. 7 f., viii. 14, 17, ix. 4 f., x. 14 f.; cf. ix. 6, 13.

utterance of the truly pious: "Not unto us, Lord; not unto us, but unto thy name give the glory." [1] And the watchword is: "Not by might, nor by power, but by My Spirit." [2]

God found Israel like a deserted child, given over to death.[3] He redeemed him;[4] nay, He was the first to create, that is, form him into a people.[5] He found Israel like grapes in the wilderness. He drew him to Himself like a son with the cords of love.[6] He begat him as His son, so that even the individual members of the people are His children.[7] He chose him as His inheritance,[8] His peculiar treasure,[9] His spouse,[10] His priest, and His anointed,[11] His Jeshurun.[12] He carried him from the womb,[13] drew him with bands of love,[14] wrote out for him laws innumerable,[15] put His Holy Spirit within him,[16] led him into Canaan,[17] the land of rest, planted him there as a noble vine [18] of the right sort, that is, one that will not belie expectation, bore him aloft on His wings as an eagle its young.[19] "They are My people," saith God, "children that will not lie." "In all their affliction, He was afflicted." [20]

And this relation did not change. God's love did not forsake Israel; nor did Israel ever find God fail to keep His part of the covenant. He was always ready to help, and was only prevented by Israel's faithlessness. Even

[1] Ps. cxv. 1.
[2] Zech. iv. 6; Ps. cxlvii. 10.
[3] Ezek. xvi. 1 ff.
[4] B. J. xxxv. 10 (Is. xxix. 22).
[5] B. J. xliii. 1, 15, 21, xliv. 2, 21, liv. 5 (Hos. viii. 14).
[6] Deut. i. 31, viii. 5; Hos. viii. 14, xi. 1; Isa. i. 2; Jer. iii. 4, 19, xxxi. 9, 20 f. (Ps. lxxx. 16, lxxiii. 15).
[7] *E.g.* Hos. ii. 1; B. J. xlv. 11, xliii. 6.
[8] Deut. iv. 20, ix. 29, xiv. 21; 1 Kings viii. 51, 53; Jer. xii. 7; B. J. xlvii. 6; Ps. xxviii. 9, xxxiii. 12, lxxviii. 71, xciv. 5, 14.
[9] Ps. cxxxv. 4.
[10] Hos. i.–iii.; Ezek. xvi. 8 ff., xxiii. 4.
[11] Hos. iv. 6; Hab. iii. 13.
[12] ישרון, a pet name formed from ישר (Deut. xxxii. 15, xxxiii. 5, 26).
[13] B. J. xlvi 3.
[14] Hos. xi. 3 ff.
[15] Hos. viii. 12.
[16] B. J. lxiii. 11.
[17] Hos. ii. 18 f.; Deut. xii. 9).
[18] Jer. ii. 21 (Isa. v. 1 ff.).
[19] Deut. xxxii. 10 f. (Hab. iii. 19).
[20] B. J. lxiii. 8, 16 (for לא read לו); cf. Amos ii. 9 f.; Jer. xiv. 8; Zech. ii. 12 (Jer. ii. 3; Ps. cxxiv. 1).

when He punished, it was a father's loving hand that smote. He is always a Fountain of living waters to His people.[1] Such love does not fail. Even to hoary old age will God bear His once-loved people. They are still His well-beloved, His anointed, His servant whom He has chosen.[2] Israel dare not complain that his way is hid from God.[3] This enduring love of God, on which all hope for the future is built, is like the earlier love out of which arose the people's estate of salvation—free, unmerited grace. God saves Israel, not because the people had honoured Him, but in spite of their having grieved Him with their sins.[4] He saves them *for His own sake, for His own name's sake,* that is, because His revelation and His purposes of salvation are bound up with this people.[5]

This belief that God's covenant love for Israel will outlive all His wrath is the key-note of the prophetic method of writing history. Such history is not the product of a definitely thought out pragmatism like that of the Levitical age. But just as little is its highest aim the ascertainment of facts. It is the expression of the belief that God is the life of His people, and His love the immovable foundation-stone both of their present and their future; that the people may have deserved nothing but wrath and punishment, but that God's mercy is greater than Israel's sin.

Consequently, in Israel, righteousness depends wholly on God's *free grace.*[6] This free grace has laid the foundations of holiness with its treasures of redemption and reconciliation,

[1] Hos. vii. 13; Deut. viii. 5; Micah vi. 3 ff.; Jer. ii. 5, 13 f., 31.

[2] B. J. xliii. 4, xlvi. 4, lxii. 5, lxiii. 16; cf. xli. 8 f., xlii. 18, xliii. 8, 10, xlv. 4 ff., xlvi. 3; Jer. xxx. 10, etc.

[3] B. J. xl. 27 f., l. 2, xlix. 14, lix. 1.

[4] B. J. xlviii. 8, xliii. 22 ff.

[5] B. J. xliii. 21, 25 ff., xlviii. 9, 11; Ezek. xxxvi. 22. (That God's honour is involved with Israel's destiny appears indeed as the main argument in the prayer of Moses, Num. xiv. 13 ff.).

[6] בחר Deut. vii. 7 f., ידע in the sense of "choose" (Gen. xviii. 19); Amos iii. 2; Hos. xiii. 5.

with all the good things, the enjoyment of which makes every son of Israel happy. The individual is, according to the view of the whole Old Testament, the object of divine love simply and solely as *a member of this community*, because of the love which God cherishes towards Israel, His first-born son. Hence his estate of salvation depends entirely on the gracious acts by which God has called this community into being. Nor is it due to any merit of his that he is personally a member of this community, that being, in no sense, the result of a definite moral act. He is simply born into it, and receives the covenant-mark of circumcision without any co-operation of his own. There is thus no act of a moral kind, such as would have been possible, had he been among another people and of another religion. The first commandment runs: "Thou shalt have no other God but the One who brought Israel out of Egypt." Hence Israel has no righteousness of his own, but only a righteousness bestowed by God and due to His free grace.[1]

4. The divine life communicated by grace can be received by faith alone. Hence, in the Old as in the New Testament, faith is the subjective condition of salvation. Nowhere in the Old Testament, it is true, is there found any doctrine of justification by faith. The idiom is everywhere perfectly elastic. As one may speak of "trusting a man"[2] or "trusting in a man,"[3] so one may speak of trusting God, "waiting upon Him,"[4] "putting one's trust in Him,"[5] "seeking refuge in Him."[6] But not one of these phrases is used in anything

[1] Even A does not overlook this grand fundamental pre-supposition, although he unquestionably connects "righteousness" much more closely with moral and ceremonial acts (Gen. vi. xvii.).

[2] האמין ל, Gen. xlv. 26; Ex. iv. 8, 9 (the root-idea being that of holding "firm and sure"); Deut. i. 32, ix. 23; cf. Ex. xiv. 31, xix. 9.

[3] האמין ב, Ex. xix. 9 (in regard to God; cf. *e.g.* Num. xiv. 11, xx. 10, 12 f.; Gen. xv. 6; 2 Kings xvii. 14; Ps. cvi. 12; Ex. iv. 5; Num. xiv. 11), האמין בי.

[4] קוה ל.

[5] בטח ב, אל, Ps. iv. 7, xxi. 8.

[6] חסה ב, Ps. vii. 2, xviii. 3, 31, ii. 12, xvi. 1.

like the Pauline sense of the word "faith." And in the ages when religious diction is more highly developed, it is not essentially different from what it was at first. "To put one's trust in God,"[1] "to seek refuge in Him," and "to trust in His word,"[2] stand parallel to each other. Immovable constancy and peace of mind,[3] or the cleaving of the soul to God,[4] is also emphasised. Other expressions give greater prominence to the hopeful side of faith, *e.g.* hoping in God,[5] waiting for His salvation,[6] hoping in His word,[7] trembling in joyous hope and expectation at the word of His promise.[8] In these words, assuredly, the essence of evangelical faith is described; not indeed in a theological setting, but by a simple emphasising of its most essential characteristics. The essence of faith on its subjective side is most comprehensively stated in the word "trust," taken quite absolutely.[9]

That this faith alone is decisive of salvation is not expressly stated by most of the writers. And even those who think so rather leave it to be inferred from the facts than state it as a dogma. This is the case with B and C. The first rise of Adam and Eve, after the fall, is really an act of faith.[10] Noah

[1] Ps. xxv. 1–3, xxvi. 1, xxxvii. 3, 5 (עלי), lii. 10, lxii. 9, lxxxiv. 13, lxxxvi. 2, xci. 2, cxii. 7, cxv. 9, cxxv. 1; 2 Kings xviii. 5; Prov. iii. 5, etc.

[2] Ps. v. 12, xxxiv. 23, xxv. 20, lvii. 2, lxxi. 1, cxviii. 8 f.; Prov. xxx. 5; Zeph. iii. 12; Nah. i. 7.

[3] סמוך, Ps. cxii. 8; B. J. xxvi. 3, נכון, Ps. lvii. 8. Here belongs also the אמונה of Hab. ii. 4 (2 Kings xii. 16, xxii. 7, "loyalty and faith").

[4] דבק ב, 2 Kings xviii. 6; cf. חשק ב, Ps. xci. 14.

[5] קוה אל, ל (also קוים with acc. B. J. xl. 31); Ps. xxv. 21, xxvii. 14, xxxvii. 34, xl. 2, cxxx. 5; cf. xxxvii. 9, lxix. 7; Hos. xii. 7; Lam. iii. 25; Isa. viii. 17.

[6] יחל and הוחיל, Ps. xxxiii. 18, xxxix. 8, xlii. 6, cxix. 74, cxxx. 5, 7, cxxxi. 3.

[7] חפה, Zeph. iii. 8; Ps. xxxiii. 20; Isa. viii. 17, xxx. 18; B. J. lxiv. 3 (Dan. xii. 12).

[8] חרד, Hos. xi. 11; B. J. lxvi. 2, 5 (Deut. i. 36, מלא אחרי יהוה).

[9] Isa. vii. 9, האמין (Ex. iv. 31); Jer. ii. 10 f. is interesting, because there an honest loyalty, even to false gods, is reckoned to the Gentiles as a virtue.

[10] Gen. iii. 20, iv. 1.

is saved because he accepts in faith the warning given him by God, incredible though it was to the bodily senses.[1] Abraham is from the first the hero of faith. By faith he quits his home to journey to a land that has not been so much as named, but to which God is to guide him.[2] By faith he accepts the promise of what appeared impossible to the senses. "He believed in Jehovah, and He counted it to him for righteousness."[3] Sarah alone ventures to laugh, and to disbelieve the unprecedented promise; and even she wishes to deny this want of faith.[4] Lot's rescue out of Sodom is due to faith. His relatives mock and perish. His wife looks behind her, and becomes a lifeless pillar.[5] By faith Abraham is ready to give up the one visible pledge of God's promise, the son whom he had miraculously obtained.[6] In short, his religious pre-eminence is due to faith. He is in very truth the "father of the faithful." Then, in spite of all his moral weakness, Jacob-Israel is in a very special degree a man of faith; Esau being, in comparison with him, the sensualist who gladly surrenders the unseen salvation of the future for the lentil-pottage of the present.[7] No other theory gives us the key to the two characters as sketched in B, C. By faith Moses has first a personal experience of salvation; then by faith the people accept him, and by faith they become the people of God.[8] Thus faith is everywhere the foundation of salvation.[9]

And as the salvation of the whole people rests upon this faith, so likewise no individual can embrace and retain this

[1] Gen. vii. 5.

[2] Gen. xii. 1–4. In B, Canaan is not named as in A. It is merely "the land that I will show thee." In B the journey to Canaan is not, as in A, really a mere continuance of the journey already begun by Terah. The crisis of faith is purposely put in the very foreground.

[3] Gen. xv. 6, C. [4] Gen. xviii. 12–15. [5] Gen. xix. 14, 17, 19, 26.

[6] Gen. xxii. 1, 12, 18. [7] *E.g.* Gen. xxv. 32 ff. [8] Ex. iii. 11 ff.

[9] Ex. iv. 1, 8 f. 31, xxiv. 3, 7 (xix. 8). How far this point of view is lost in A may be learned, *e.g.* by comparing the history of Abraham in A with that in B. But even A, of course, acknowledged faith as the principle that saves, and unbelief as the principle that destroys (cf. on the one hand, Ex. vii. 5, xiv. 31, and on the other, Num. xi. 4, xiv. 11, xx. 10).

salvation except by faith. The Israelite finds himself placed, by birth and circumcision, in a circle well-pleasing to God. He has not to win for himself, by a sinlessness which the law nowhere requires of him, a relation to God void of reproach, or to merit salvation by earnest efforts of self-denial and deeds of high endeavour. Of asceticism this religion knows nothing. Even in the law, fasting occurs only as a preparation for the great day of atonement, or as a voluntary expression of penitence.[1] All that is required, and all that the "righteous" among this people ever show, is in truth an active faith. To surrender himself wholly and unreservedly to the Redeemer of Israel as his God, to accept the salvation embodied in the covenant as his salvation, to acknowledge and love the ordinances of life revealed in it as the ordinances of redemption; in short, to acknowledge all the habits of life developed by the influence of the revelation and the sacred customs of Israel as those that should influence and govern his own life, to be convinced that thus only are true life, happiness, and salvation to be found,—all this is what makes a true Israelite. Without this faith there is no morality; since faith in this God as the only God of salvation is the first commandment. Without this faith, moreover, there is no atonement; for all atonement is effected, not by human acts, but by ordinances and arrangements of divine grace. This fact is so fundamental that its influence is everywhere felt, even in the sacrificial ritual of A. Nay more, the smallest sin, if it be of the nature of rebellion, by which a person puts himself, through unbelief, beyond the pale of salvation, and declines to acknowledge Israel's salvation as his, is unpardonable. This is to despise God. So long as a person remains estranged from the will of God, he cannot obtain forgiveness.

5. Accordingly, an Israelite's righteousness depends, not on his own merits, but on God's grace. And it is obtained, not by "works" or acts good in themselves, but by faith, the

[1] Lev. xvi. 29, 31; Num. xxix. 7. xxx. 14.

only source from which good works can spring. But not till Israel's religion and nationality were in the utmost jeopardy, and the visible blessings of salvation were disappearing and perishing day by day, was a clear consciousness of the necessity of faith attained. In such times the personal relation of the people and of the individual to faith had necessarily to come to the front in quite a different fashion from what it did in the days when the national religion was being quietly developed. In such times the saints had to turn with greater resolution from the visible blessings of salvation to the eternal invisible reality, or else to apprehend them as future blessings. Faith became the assurance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen. Accordingly, it is not till the eighth century that we find justification by faith definitely taught by the poets and prophets.

Faith is what the prophets require of the people as the necessary condition of salvation. "If ye will not believe, surely ye shall not be established."[1] In face of the world, with its power and glory, in face of vain self-confidence, the true Israel puts its trust in God, and lives by means of this steady, constant loyalty to Him.[2] "Cursed be the man that trusteth in man, and maketh flesh his arm; blessed be the man that trusteth in God."[3] Deuteronomy specially censures the unbelief of the people,[4] and insists that the aim of divine revelation is to awaken a faith which even signs and wonders will not shake.[5] Canaan is given to the people just because it is a *land of faith*, the prosperity of which remains continually dependent on the goodness of God in sending rain.[6] And the exilic Isaiah especially demands of the people

[1] Isa. vii. 9, viii. 17, xxviii. 16; 2 Chron. xx. 20.

[2] Hab. ii. 4; Jer. v. 3; B. J. xxv. 9, xxvi. 2, 3, 8; Ps. lxii. 2, 6 (cf. Jer. xxxix. 18; B. J. l. 10; Isa. xxx. 15).

[3] Jer. xvii. 5, 7; Nah. i. 7; B. J. xlix. 23; Zeph. iii. 8, 12.

[4] Deut. i. 32, ix. 23 (2 Kings xvii. 14).

[5] Deut. vii. 17 ff., viii. 3, xiii. 2 f., xxxii. 11, 39.

[6] Deut. xi. 10–17. This passage is of great interest, as showing us the author's view of the laws of nature, and his idea of miracles.

a firm conviction of God's irresistible might, as well as of His inexhaustible covenant love.[1] Hence the true Israel is the people of the *poor and needy*, who have their faith centred, not in themselves, but in God.[2] And as the psalms of the prophetic period testify to the blessedness of faith, the book of Job shows us that the inmost secret thereof is to keep hold of God, even where reason and human insight can no longer recognise Him.

For the prophets' faith throws itself, in the nature of things, more and more upon hope, upon the salvation of the future, rather than on that of the present, which is daily crumbling into ruins. The piety of the prophetic age, with the exception of the last century before the destruction of Jerusalem and the Exile, was certainly never what Christian people often imagine Old Testament piety to have been,—a piety that was absolutely dissatisfied with the present life, and concerned solely with the coming salvation. It is, however, the watchword and the mark of the saints "to wait upon the Lord, who has for the present hidden His face from both houses of Israel"[3]—that is, in spite of God's apparent displeasure, to cling to His mercy in the future. God acts for him who waits upon Him, delivers him who calls upon His name, and never puts to shame such as hope in Him.[4] Hence faith is the way of life; he that putteth his trust in God shall inherit His holy mountain.[5]

As faith is the cause of salvation, so unbelief is the cause of all Israel's misery.[6] It allows his convictions to be determined by what is material, by the power of the world, external misfortune, and a sense of his own strength; it is faint-hearted doubt as to the power of God, or haughty defiance of His will.

6. It in no way conflicts with the fundamental idea of Old Testament salvation, as we have just explained it, that

[1] B. J. xl. 28 ff., l. 2, lix. 1; cf. xlix. 14 f., l. 1 ff.
[2] B. J. lxvi. 2 f.; cf. Ps. xxii., lxix., etc.
[3] Isa. viii. 17 (even heathen lands "wait upon Him," B. J. li. 5).
[4] B. J. xlix. 23, lxiv. 3 f.; Joel ii. 17; Nah. i. 7. [5] B. J. lvii. 13.
[6] Deut. i. 32, ix. 23; 2 Kings xvii. 14; Ps. lxxviii. 8, 19, 22, 32, etc.

in the book of the covenant, and also in Deuteronomy and the prophets, God lays moral injunctions on His people, and makes "life" contingent on obedience to them. For that does not mean that the Israelite attains to an estate of salvation by his work. It is only on the ground of being already in an estate of salvation that such work is possible, and gets a real value. And, on the other hand, since the divine life is revealed in the human as determining the aim of the latter, it cannot be received in faith without at the same time binding the will; that is, unless one honestly intends to take this revealed life as the rule of one's own life. No one can honestly enter into a covenant without intending to keep its conditions to the letter.

Hence in Israel the law is certainly not, in the first instance, a mere demand of *a moral kind*, given to man as man. It is the unfolding of the divine life for this people and for this age. It is, in the first instance, a gift of grace. It shows the people a way of life which embraces and defines all the circumstances of their natural life. A non-Israelite or an unbeliever cannot fulfil it at all; but a believer will not feel its restrictions irksome. In so far as he is a believing child of his people, he cannot for a single moment refuse to obey it.[1]

We have here undoubtedly one of the main limitations of Mosaism. The individual demands for material holiness that were a living force among the people, and were afterwards codified in the law, did not in themselves stand in any direct relation to the fundamental thoughts which spring spontaneously out of faith. Many single commandments are, at least when looked at from the outside, quite independent of faith. Faith, it is true, necessarily inclined a man *to obey the law as a whole.* But in many individual acts this inclination could

[1] Such is the relation, as expounded even in A. The covenant with Noah includes the hallowing of human life, and the prohibition of blood; the covenant with Abraham includes circumcision and walking "before God" (one is to think of God's eye being fixed upon one's path in life) (Gen. ix. 4 ff., xvii. 1). And the covenant with Israel pledges the people to obey the principles of national holiness (Ex. xv. 26, xix. 5, xx. 1 ff.).

not work directly, but only indirectly, because such acts were habitual in Israel. In a perfect morality, however, every act must be directly due to heartfelt conviction. In this respect the prophetic period, in so far as it is influenced by the prophets themselves, shows us a decidedly higher stage. Inasmuch as morality is mainly traced back to the disposition as its centre, to goodness and truth, and the outward forms of it thrown quite into the background, it becomes a direct and necessary expression of faith in the covenant God and in His goodness and truth. Works which are of any value at all become fruits of faith.[1]

The limitation just mentioned did not become an actual danger to the progress of religion, until the labours of the priestly lawgivers became national laws, and thus introduced an undue amount of Levitical ceremonial into the ordinary life of Israel. Then the hitherto natural externality of righteousness became conscious Pharisaism. In former days the prophets, from Amos to Jeremiah, had defended the religious and moral conception of Israel's calling against the external view held by the people, and afterwards against the exaggerated value which the priestly circles were beginning to attach to salvation by works. Isa. lviii. still speaks quite in the tone of the great prophets. But after Ezra the centre of gravity becomes more and more displaced. The law had undergone a long and varied process of development, and every Israelite of the later period thought it a divine, Mosaic unity. Everything had been worked into its great fundamental thoughts, and made organic, in order to express the one self-revealing life of the holy God. The taking out of a single stone made the whole temple totter. Everything was combined into a magnificent unity, that gathered the whole life of the people, its pettiest details as well as its greatest, around the one centre. And since, according to the main idea of the covenant, Israel was to be a holy people, that is, God's peculiar treasure, the whole law was regarded as a revelation

[1] 1 Sam. xv. 22; Jer. vii. 22.

of what befits such a people and is in keeping with the true character of its God. But this was in principle the transition from a religion of faith to a religion of legality, however certain it may be, as numerous psalms prove, that the piety of many individual Israelites preserved them from it.

7. From this time onwards, this became more and more the ruling tendency. It was to the outward forms, ordinances, and objects of worship, by which Israel was distinguished from the other peoples, that the religious community which inhabited the second Jerusalem attached the greatest interest and importance; and the law, of which A is now the centre, is represented as practically identical with God's whole revelation to Israel. In the holy Jerusalem, as the city is called on Maccabean coins, the objects of highest honour are the temple and its priesthood. The servants of God who stand by night in the house of God,[1] the priests,—who were already beginning to be described as angels of God,[2] if indeed they were not thought of as being, at least relatively, exempt from human sin,—stand before every one else.[3] And in direct opposition to the noble spirit in which the prophets subordinate the sacred form to the spiritual meaning, such forms now begin to be placed in the foreground. Even Malachi, who otherwise still preaches pure prophetic morality,—charity, fidelity, and godly fear,[4]—and who, indeed, insists that the hard-hearted men who put away their wives cannot possibly offer to God acceptable sacrifices,[5] nevertheless denounces, in the strongest terms, the insufficiency of the offerings;[6] and he is particularly severe on the priests for their careless and arbitrary performance of the sacred ritual.[7] The chief anxiety of these

[1] Ps. cxxxiv. 1. [2] Mal. ii. 7; Eccles. v. 5.

[3] Dan. ix. 6, according to Hitzig; to me the interpretation seems hazardous.

[4] Mal. i. 6, ii. 10, 15, iii. 4. [5] Mal. ii. 13 f.

[6] Mal. i. 7–14, iii. 9 f. This emphasising of "public worship," the cessation of which would be the heaviest misfortune that could befall the country, is one of the features which point to the conclusion that the book of Joel should be assigned to this period (i. 9).

[7] Ezra ii. 36 ff., iii. 3 ff., vii. 7, viii. 15 ff., x. 18; Neh. viii. 1 ff., 14 ff., ix. 4. 13 ff., x. 31 ff., xiii. 15 ff.

men is about singers, doorkeepers, Levites, the proper observance of feast days and Sabbaths, and the providing of abundant means for carrying on public worship.[1] The division of time is regulated by the morning and the evening sacrifice.[2] There are men regularly appointed to conduct the prayers of the congregation.[3] In like manner, according to Daniel, the desecration of the golden vessels of the temple brings down judgment upon the Chaldean king.[4] The consecration of the Holy of holies, and the offering of the daily sacrifice, form the turning point of the prophecy.[5] The unpardonable sin of Antiochus is the altering of times and statutes.[6]

In times of religious persecution, when the faithful observance of outward forms is at once a bold confession of one's own religion and an expression of fidelity to it, such emphasing of sacred form may be perfectly lawful and praiseworthy. For this reason even the Exilic Isaiah gives prominence to the Sabbath and to commandments as to food. And in the heroic age of the Maccabees, the prominence given to such things is required by loyalty to the true faith. But with the return of quieter times, any such tendency is a great danger to the inner truth of religion.

This point of view is most strongly illustrated by the way in which the history of Israel is set before us in Chronicles. This book can find no more important matters to describe than minute details about public worship,[7] and priestly rights.[8] It never tires of showing that the divine

[1] Neh. ix. 4, xi. 20 ff., xii. 15 ff.
[2] Ezra ix. 4 (Dan. ix. 21).
[3] Neh. xi. 17; 1 Chron. xxiii. 30.
[4] Dan. v. 1 ff.
[5] Dan. ix. 24, xii. 11.
[6] Dan. vii. 25, viii. 11 ff., ix. 27.
[7] 1 Chron. ix. 19 ff., xiii., xv., xvi., xxii., xxviii., xxix.; cf. vi. 16 ff., 24, 29, ix. 33, xv. 16 ff., xvi. 4 ff., 37 ff., xxiii. 5, xxv.; 2 Chron. ii., iii., iv., xxix. 25 ff., xxx., xxxi., xxxv.; cf. viii. 14 f.
[8] 1 Chron. vi. 33 ff., ix. 26 ff., xiii. 2, xv. 2 ff., xvi. 4 ff., 37 ff., xxiii.–xxvi.; 2 Chron. v. 12, vii. 6, viii. 12 ff., xvii. 8, xx. 21, xxiii. 18, xxix. 11 ff., 34, xxx. 15–21, xxxi. 2 ff., 11 ff., xxxv. 2–19. (Exaggeration of their political influence, 2 Chron. vi. 41, xix 8 ff., xxiii. 2, 4–9, xxiv. 2 f., xxvi. 17 ff.)

blessing or curse depends on the greater or less purity of the worship.[1] Uzziah's attack on the privileges of the Levites is the cause of his leprosy.[2] That king Asa, when sick, consulted physicians, is represented as a sign of unbelief.[3] David, the man of God, is represented as scarcely busying himself during the last years of his life about anything but the building of the temple, and the ceremonial arrangements of the Levites.[4] Indeed, he must have got, like Moses, a plan of God's house from God Himself. Solomon gets a pulpit made for him as if he had been a real "Sopher."[5] The daughter of Pharaoh has a palace of her own, because the ark of the covenant has made the city of David too holy for her.[6] The Levites and the priests leave the idolatrous Northern kingdom and betake themselves to Judah. Athaliah is deposed, not by the soldiers, but by the Levites.[7] The Chronicler tells us nothing about David's adultery, his flight from Absalom, or Solomon's idolatry; he knows nothing about Sennacherib compelling Hezekiah to pay tribute. On the other hand, Josiah's death has to be attributed to his refusal to believe the word of God from the mouth of Necho.[8] Jehoshaphat's victory is won by prayer and by the singing of the Levites.[9] In the history of Manasseh we get quite a little sermon on idolatry, punishment, penitence, deliverance, and thankful joy.[10]

When the outward forms of religion are so much emphasised,

[1] *E.g.* 2 Chron. xii. 1, 7, 12, xiii. 10, 12, 14, xiv. 2–end, xv. 8, 15, xvii. 4 ff., xix. 3, xx. 3, xxi. 10 f., 16, 18, xxii. 5 ff., xxiii. 17, xxiv. 18, 24, xxv. 10, 11, 14, 20, 22, 27, xxvi. 4 ff., 17 ff., xxvii. 2, 4 ff., xxviii. 1, 5 ff., 19, xxix. 2–end, xxx. 1, xxxiii. 2 ff., 11 ff., 22 ff., xxxiv. 2 ff., 27, xxxvi. 9 ff.

[2] 2 Chron. xxvi. 16 ff. (cf. 2 Kings xv. 4 ff.).

[3] 2 Chron. xvi. 12 (cf. on the other hand Jes. Sir. xxxviii. 1 ff.).

[4] 1 Chron. xxii., xxviii., xxix. (2 Chron. viii. 14). The headings in the Psalter presuppose as an axiom the "clerical" character of "the sweet singer" of Israel.

[5] 1 Chron. xxviii. 19; cf. Ex. xxv. 40 (2 Chron. vi. 13).

[6] 2 Chron. viii. 11.

[7] 2 Chron. xi. 13 ff., xiii. 9–12 (xxiii.).

[8] 2 Chron. xxxv. 22.

[9] 2 Chron. xx. 21 f., 3, 13.

[10] 2 Chron. xxxiii. 11 ff.

it is quite impossible to retain, in its purity, the grand prophetic conception that the moral law has to do only with the disposition. Despite the fulness of moral knowledge by which even these ages are characterised, undue prominence is given to the details of ceremonial purity, and thus the connection between conduct and faith is loosened. Religion becomes more and more legal. Morality comes to mean doing "the works of the law." There can be no question that this is the theory which determines the Chronicler's view of morality.[1] The morality of the book of Esther is of exactly the same stamp.[2] In all Ezra's efforts at reform, festivals and Sabbaths, Levitical statutes, and avoidance of what is foreign are always put in the forefront.[3] The chief means of securing one's wishes, whether special or general, appear to be fasting, long prayers, and mourning.[4] Such is the meaning that echoes through the didactic Psalm cxix., with its emphasising of prayer seven times a day, and loyalty to the law.[5] And even in Daniel true piety demands, not merely an unflinching heroic confession of one's own religion,[6] but strict abstinence from unclean foods,[7] and regular prayer with the face duly turned towards Jerusalem.[8] As means of atonement alms,[9] fasting, and prayer in sackcloth and ashes are recommended.[10] Thus, in opposition to the Old Testament idea of salvation, there is here in process of formation that δικαιοσύνη ἐξ ἔργων against which Jesus, and afterwards Paul, had to struggle. The ideal of righteousness is no longer integrity sustained by piety, but obedience to God's statutes and judgments, as shown in exemplary fulfilment of prescribed

[1] 1 Chron. v. 25, x. 13 f., cf. xiii. 10, xxviii. 7 f., xxix. 19; cf. Neh. ix. 29.
[2] Esth. iv. 3, 16, ix. 19–32 (31).
[3] Ezra x. 1, 9; Neh. ix. 34, 38, x. 29 f., i. 5, 7, 9.
[4] Ezra viii. 21, 23, ix. 6 ff.; Neh. i. 4 (Joel ii. 16).
[5] Ps. cxix. 30, 38, 76, 82, 103, 130, 154, 162, 164; cf. Ps. cxli. 2.
[6] Dan. iii. 18, vi. 6, 11 (דת). [7] Dan. i. 8–16. [8] Dan. ii. 19, vi. 10.
[9] Dan. iv. 24. [10] Dan. ix. 3, x. 3, 12.

religious and ceremonial forms. Beyond a doubt, the Preacher has already in view such "righteousness" as this when he gives the recommendation, "Be not righteous over much."[1] For moral indolence is not at all in his line of thought, and he evidently means by this righteousness, sacrifices, refusal to swear, etc.[2] Besides, his warning against babbling in prayer, and against hasty vows,[3] presupposes such degeneration.

The sense of sin is of a similar kind. It is very deep and humbling. In many books of this period, indeed, there is almost too great an inclination to self-accusation,[4] though in such a way that this penitential confession appears quite meritorious in itself,[5] is mainly directed to sacred form,[6] and frankly alternates with a very decided prominence being given to the person's own righteousness and merits.[7] A national life, knit together by the bonds of a thousand laws, the keeping of which is a condition of its "holiness," must necessarily be weighed down with a consciousness of "impurity." This, in its turn, produces an atonement of an external kind based on positive statutes, and then easily changes into a proud consciousness of "purity."

Even in the centuries immediately before Christ, the after-effects of prophetic morality are still felt. In the books of the Hellenistic school we find no endeavour after "the righteousness of the law" properly so called; in Jesus the son of Sirach, at least, there is only a trace of it here and there. But in Baruch who, in other respects, follows the prophets closely, special importance is given, not merely to Jerusalem itself,[8] but also to weeping, fasting, prayer, sacrifices, and

[1] Eccles. vii. 16. [2] Eccles. ix. 2. [3] Eccles. v. 1, 3, 4.

[4] Ezra ix. 6, 7, 15, x. 1, 9; Neh. i. 7, ix. 1 f., 16, 26, xiii. 15 ff.; Dan. ix. 4–20; Ps. lxxix. 8 f., cvi. 6.

[5] Ezra x. 1 ff.; Neh. i. 7, ix. 1 ff.

[6] Cf. the passages from Ezra and Nehemiah in Note 4.

[7] Neh. v. 19, xiii. 14, 22, 31. In Ecclesiastes sin is regarded more as a necessary evil (vii. 18, 21), but God is declared free of all blame in connection with it (ver. 29).

[8] Bar. iv. 8 ff.

feasts.[1] Though the book of Tobit has, on the whole, a thoroughly moral tendency, it attaches undue importance to almsgiving,[2] prayer, weeping and fasting,[3] and to going up to the temple in Jerusalem to offer tithes and partake of the joyous sacrificial meal.[4] These things, as well as the horror of eating heathen bread,[5] and the stress laid upon burying fellow-countrymen,[6] show us what a pious man, in the time of the second temple, regarded as the *beau-ideal* of righteousness.[7] The first book of the Maccabees shows us that the Hasidæans, who seek righteousness and judgment,[8] are specially indignant at any desecration of the temple service, or breach of the commandments regarding food,[9] and are zealous for circumcision, the Sabbath, and the Sabbatical year.[10] The resolution to defend themselves on the Sabbath day appears just to be a reaction in favour of its healthy observance.[11] The second book of Maccabees is specially fond of glorifying the temple itself by legends,[12] insists on circumcision, and on the commandments regarding food, as well as on the Levitical arrangements[13] in general, the Sabbaths[14] and the other feast days.[15] Prominence is given to weeping and fasting.[16] The doctrine of retribution is understood in a very external fashion—so that, for example, all the Jews who fell in a certain luckless battle were afterwards made out to be men who had defiled themselves with idolatry.[17] The

[1] Bar. i. 5, 10, 14.
[2] Tob. i. 3, 16 ff., ii. 15, iv. 7 ff., cf. 16, xii. 8 f., xiv. 4, 9, 10, 14.
[3] Tob. xii. 9.
[4] Tob. i. 6, 7 (ii. 1).
[5] Tob. i. 12.
[6] Tob. i. 17 f., ii. 4.
[7] Tob. i. 3, ii. 14, iv. 7, xii. 9.
[8] 1 Macc. vii. 17, ii. 29; cf. 2 Macc. xiv. 6.
[9] 1 Macc. i. 43, 45 ff., 54, 62 f., iii. 47 ff., iv. 42 ff., vi. 7.
[10] 1 Macc. i. 15 f., 60, ii. 46 (against the Gymnasia i. 15; cf. 2 Macc. iv. 12 ff.); cf. 1 Macc. i. 43, ii. 32–38, vi. 49, 53.
[11] 1 Macc. ii. 41.
[12] 2 Macc. i. 8 ff., v. 15, xiii. 23, xv. 18, vi. 2 (iii. 18 ff., a prayer for the preservation of the temple-treasures).
[13] 2 Macc. vi. 10, 18, vii. i.; cf. i. 8.
[14] 2 Macc. vi. 6, viii. 26, xii. 38, xv. 1 ff.
[15] 2 Macc. xii. 31.
[16] 2 Macc. xiii. 12.
[17] 2 Macc. xii. 40 ff.; cf. v. 17, xiii. 8.

intercession of Onias restores Heliodorus to health; and two thousand drachmæ are sent to Jerusalem as a sin-offering for the slain, that it may be well with them in the resurrection.[1] These and other instances of a piety becoming more and more external[2] are found alongside of a truly admirable spirit of penitence.[3]

The third book of the Maccabees turns mainly on the inviolable sanctity of the temple.[4] Prayer in appropriate attitudes is given an extraordinary importance.[5] But the book of Judith, in particular, has a tone quite in accordance with Pharisaism proper. In it the high priest, even in Nebuchadnezzar's time, is, along with the elders, the civil head of the people.[6] When the heroine of the book is to be represented as extremely pious, the greatest emphasis is laid on sacrifices and incense-offering, on lifelong widowhood, on much fasting, which is interrupted only during the festivals, on lustrations, clean meats, long prayers, and mourning in sackcloth and ashes.[7] It is for the holy vessels which have been consecrated anew that the greatest apprehension is felt.[8] And if there is no lawlessness in Israel, that is, if the people refrain from idolatry and unclean meats, then they are looked upon as invincible, because in that case they are "upright before God."[9] These are clearly traces of the teaching which compelled Paul to oppose Judaism, the religion of the law, by Christianity, the religion of faith. With the righteousness of

[1] 2 Macc. iii. 32 ff., xii. 43 ff.

[2] Along with these, *e.g.*, the view of suicide so thoroughly characteristic of antiquity (2 Macc. xiv. 42 ff.).

[3] 2 Macc. vii. 18, 32, 38.

[4] 3 Macc. i. 29.

[5] 3 Macc. i. 16, ii. 1.

[6] Jud. iv. 6, xv. 10.

[7] Jud. iv. 7 ff., vi. 15 ff., viii. 6, 7, ix. 1, 13, x. 1 ff., 5, xii. 7, 9, 20, xvi. 18, 19, 27.

[8] Jud. iv. 2 f.

[9] Jud. v. 21; cf. viii. 18, 21, xi. 11 f. The fourth book of Ezra keeps practically within Daniel's circle of thought; cf. *e.g.* viii. 32, 36, ix. 7, and v. 13. 20, vi. 31, 35, etc. The ideal of righteousness in the Solomonic Psalms is simply that of the better Pharisaism, cf. *e.g.* Ps. iii. 8 ff., ix. 7 ff; indeed, the Pharisaic antagonism to the Sadducee aristocracy shows itself all through (*e.g.* Ps. iv.).

the prophets, from Amos to Jeremiah, Christianity might at once have joined hands. Face to face with this religion, it had to create something altogether new. Here, also, we are shown how in the kingdom of God great advances are rendered possible by apparent retrogression and decay.

CHAPTER III.

THE HOLINESS OF THE PEOPLE IN REGARD TO RELIGIOUS AND MORAL ACTS. THE MORAL LAW.

LITERATURE.—Bertheau, *Die sieben Gruppen mosaischer Gesetze in den drei mittleren Büchern des Pentateuch*, Gött. 1840. Ewald, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, ii. 205–217. Geffken, *Ueber die verschiedenen Eintheilungen des Decalogus und den Einfluss derselben auf den Cultus*, Hamb. 1838. E. Meier, *Ueber den Decalog*, 1846. Sonntag und Züllig, "Ueber die Eintheilung des Decalogs" (*Theol. Stud. u. Krit.*, 1836, 1; 1837, 1, 2). Lemme, *Die religionsgeschichtliche Bedeutung des Decalogs*, 1880. Otto, *Decalogische Untersuchungen*, Halle 1857. Bruno Bauer, "Die Principien der mosaischen Rechts- und Religionsverfassung" (*Zeitsch. f. speculative Theologie*, Bd. ii. 2, p. 297 ff., 1838). Oehler, "Decalog, Blutrache" (in *Herzog*, 2nd ed., Fr. Delitzsch). G. M. Redslob, *Die Leviratsche bei den Hebräern vom archäologischen u. praktischen Standpunkte untersucht*, 1836. Benary, *De Hebræorum leviratu*, Berlin 1835. "Die Eintheilung des Decalogs" (*Erlanger Zeitschrift für Protestantismus und Kirche*, November 1858). Mielziner, *Die Verhältnisse der Sclaven bei den alten Hebräern nach biblischen und talmudischen Quellen dargestellt*, Copenhagen 1859.

1. The fundamental condition of righteousness in Israel is, of course, reverence for the civil, religious, and moral statutes in force among the people. In the first place, these were

briefly summarised in the law of Moses as "the ten commandments." In the next place, they were given, by the moral preaching of the prophets, more and more inward depth, and were set firmly on their everlasting foundations. Finally, in the later legal writings, since Deuteronomy, they were more and more worked out into details.

If one wished to divide the moral law into the two tables on which the narrative supposes it to have been originally written, so that they might be equal in contents and size, one would be tempted to distinguish between laws regarding God and laws regarding one's neighbour. At first sight, indeed, this appears quite a happy division when one thinks of Gen. xvii. 1, "Walk before Me" and "be *thou* perfect." But there, as here, morality as a whole is looked at as a duty toward God, as a result of His declaration, "I am holy." It is better, therefore, as Geffken rightly sees, to divide the commandments, as Philo and Josephus already did,[1] into five of piety and five of probity. As a refutation of false surmises regarding the inner plan of the Decalogue, such as are still made by Züllig and especially by Sonntag, the work of Geffken is perfectly conclusive, and is, in fact, a model work. It is not right, after a fashion early known and still in vogue among the later Jews, to regard as the first commandment only the sentence, "I am the Lord thy God," and then to take as the second commandment the prescription, "Thou shalt have none other gods before Me, and thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image." For the first is not a commandment but a doctrine; and the second unites two quite distinct things. Nor is it permissible to stretch the first commandment, according to the Lutheran-Roman custom, so as to include the prohibition of idolatry and image-worship; and to divide the last commandment against covetousness into two. For in the one case two separate things are combined; and in the other a commandment is divided, the unity of which,

[1] Philo, *Ed. Mg.* i. 496, ii. 188. Joseph. *Ant.* iii. 5. 5.

though clear enough from its contents, is made still clearer by the fact that the object of covetousness, put first in Deuteronomy, is different from the one put first in Exodus; so that by this method of division the ninth commandment would have to be different in the two recensions.[1] Of the view based on Deuteronomy, that in the ninth commandment one is forbidden to covet one's neighbour's wife, and in the tenth to covet his goods, as well as of the numbering adopted by Hesychius,[2] who leaves out the commandment regarding the Sabbath and then makes the first two into three—(1) I am the Lord thy God, (2) Thou shalt have no other gods before Me, (3) Thou shalt not make any graven image—there can be no real defence. The only right way is to take the old Hebrew plan, which the Reformed Church has followed, and make five commandments of piety—(1) No other gods, (2) No image, (3) No dishonouring of God's name, (4) No desecrating of His holy time, (5) Honouring of parents as *ὄργανα γεννήσεως*[3]; and five commandments of probity—(1) Sacredness of life, (2) Of marriage, (3) Of property, (4) No false witness, (5) No covetousness.

The fundamental demand of the law is that the people regard their covenant God as the one only God, the one only source of salvation, and remain faithful to Him, conditions on the observance of which the very existence of the covenant depends. This being settled, it also follows that one must honour this God in accordance with His true nature, and not insult Him by doing anything unworthy of Him. In the first place, therefore, He must not be dishonoured by any one making a material likeness of Him, dragging Him down, as it were, into fellowship with the created, the material, like the heathen nature-gods. This alone can be the meaning of the commandment, not the exclusion of the images of strange gods.[4]

[1] In Exodus, "the house;" in Deuteronomy, "the wife."
[2] On Lev. vii. [3] Philo, i. 497.
[4] Unquestionably, it is not every image that is meant but only every image *made to be worshipped.*

By means of this commandment the religion of Israel shook itself clear of the similarity to the nature-religions which originally clung to it, as well as of its own more imperfect elements, and kept rising to a more and more perfect conception of God, and to a higher spiritual realisation of its own religious principle.

Since the name of God is no empty echo, but the holy expression of His self-revealing essence, it must not be dishonoured by being brought into connection with anything untrue or vain[1] which would lower its majesty. Finally, the Sabbath—the time set apart for the honour of this God and sacred to Him—must be kept undesecrated. It would be sacrilege, a desecration of what is a holy thing, to turn this day to any common use for one's own profit or pleasure. This is the point of view which regulates everything. It is a question of touching what is dedicated to God.

With these commandments to honour the covenant, God has associated the commandment to honour parents.[2] Only on this foundation can a family be reared with a due sense of filial piety and godly fear. This commandment is then widened so as to inculcate respect to old age in general and to the Elohim of the people, that is, to the magistrates.[3] In the Old Testament, as among all the better peoples of antiquity, the laws both of the family and of the State have a religious character and are regarded with holy awe.

The main requirement of Israelitish probity is the sacredness of the life and property of others. On these commandments all human society worthy of the name is securely based. They treat of what Israel must not do—that is, of what cannot be permitted in the national life of Israel. In justice to history, however, it must be maintained that these commandments do not by any means contain all that may,

[1] נשׂא לשׁוא
[2] Cf. Ex. xxi. 15; Lev. xix. 3, xx. 9; Deut. xxvii. 16.
[3] Lev. xix. 32, xx. 9; cf. *e.g.* Ex. xxii. 28.

from a higher point of view, be put into them; what Jesus, for example, in the Sermon on the Mount, has put into His law, or what is included in them in the incomparable exposition given in Luther's Shorter Catechism. They are simply prohibitions intended to make the life and property of one's neighbour inviolable and secure against force and craft.

In the first place, life itself is made safe. In accordance with the general plan of his work, A has introduced at the very commencement of human history the divine arrangement which establishes the sanctity of human life, and protects it by the commandment as to the avenging of blood.[1] As a matter of fact, this practice is certainly one of the very first which men would adopt on beginning to live together in an orderly way, and one which goes back far beyond any historical period known to us. But it is important to notice that, in the Law, injury to human life is no longer looked at from the standpoint of private rights, as an injury to the relatives, for which they may exact either vengeance or blood-money, but from the religious and ethical standpoint, as a dishonouring of the holy land and the holy people that have been dedicated to God. In Israel intentional murder is absolutely unpardonable; no ransom can be taken for "blood."[2]

Next to life comes marriage, the most tender of property relationships. The holy sanctity of this relationship depends, according to B's narrative, on God's own arrangements at creation. The marriage of one man and one woman is to form the fundamental indissoluble relationship before which all other ties, even the most sacred, must give way. The woman is created as an help meet for man; not to be an idle plaything of the moment, but to share his labours and his joys. She is created to be a suitable mate, and therefore endowed with the

[1] Gen. ix. 4 ff.

[2] *E.g.* Num. xxxv. 16 ff., 31 ff.; Ex. xxi. 12 ff.; Ps. ix. 13—God an avenger of blood.

same rights of moral personality as the man; she is not created to satisfy brutal lust or pine away in slavish toil.[1] Thus marriage is thought of ideally as "monogamy," which it manifestly was to all intents and purposes in Israel, although the liberty of the man was not restricted by law.[2] The violation of marriage rights is always regarded as an injury to property and honour. The husband who, during his marriage, has intercourse with an unmarried woman does not commit adultery. Adultery means only the violation of another man's wife; and this, according to strict law, includes his betrothed.[3] The commandment against adultery is certainly not meant to forbid all sexual licence. That is, indeed, condemned by the general voice of the people, but it is never directly forbidden in the Old Testament. Even the passages which might be so interpreted[4] refer to the dishonouring of a free-born maiden, for which her family is entitled to demand compensation and redress. Sexual intercourse with a slave or with a loose woman is represented as quite within the sphere of personal liberty.[5] The commandment in the Decalogue consequently forbids the touching of another's wife, which was regarded in Israel from the earliest times as a deadly sin.[6]

With this is closely connected sacredness of property in general. And as one must not injure a neighbour by actual violence, so one must not do it by false witness, which would endanger life and property.[7] For even in the ninth command-

[1] עזר כנגדו, a help, as standing face to face with him; that is, corresponding to him, suitable, equal; cf. in general Gen. ii. 18, 23, 24. The later curse of sin does not disannul this divine idea of marriage.

[2] So Abraham, Jacob (Gen. xvi. 3, xxix. 24, 28; cf. xxx. 4, 9).

[3] Lev. xx. 10 ff.; Deut. xxii. 23 ff.

[4] *E.g.* Gen. xxxiv. 7–14.; Ex. xxii. 16 ff.; Deut. xxii. 28.

[5] So Gen. xxxiv. 31 (הכזונה יעשׂה). In Lev. xix. 20 intercourse with a female slave is made punishable only because she is *the property of another man.*

[6] Gen. xx. 9; cf. Lev. xx. 10 ff. Even in the beautiful parable in 2 Sam. xii., adultery is looked upon as a violation of the rights of property.

[7] Cf. Lev. xix. 16.

ment it is a question not so much as to the duty of truthfulness as to bearing such witness against one's neighbour before the congregation as might make him lose life or property. Finally, one must not busy one's self with plans and undertakings the result of which would be to get possession of the property of one's neighbour with an appearance of right. This is, I think, the meaning of "coveting." For the word generally includes the intention of getting actual possession of the things wished for.[1] The history of Naboth's vineyard is an example of such "coveting." The other explanation, which considers it a prohibition of evil desires as such, is in itself hardly suitable to the character of a commandment which must be directed against something that admits of outward proof, and must have something tangible to punish with its "let him be accursed." Thus the Decalogue includes within its beautifully simple circle the chief duties of religion and morality in Israel, the violation of which is worthy of death.

2. The motives which impelled an Israelite to the practice of what we call "morality" were without doubt originally the same as have proved effective among all peoples on a similar plane of civilisation. It is family feeling,[2] a feeling which which was so strong in early times that people did not hesitate even to commit incest in order to obtain the blessing of a family,[3] and which displays its fairest moral side in the honour shown to parents.[4] It likewise implies respect for the great fundamental conditions of social life, which is

[1] Cf. Ex. xxxiv. 24 ; Micah ii. 2. Although it is said in Prov. vi. 25 אל־תחמד בלבבך, it must not be forgotten that לב in the Old Testament is not so much *the seat of the feelings* as of *the thoughts and plans*. Deuteronomy v. 18, by using חמד and התאוה alternately, may perhaps, in accordance with its general teaching of an inward morality, actually forbid the lusting after one's neighbour's property in the sense of mere desire.

[2] Gen. xxvii. 41, xxix. 10, xxviii. 6, xxxvii. 18 ff., xxxiv. 25, l. 15 ; 2 Sam. xiii. 28, etc.

[3] Gen. xix. 32 ff., xxxviii. 14 ff., 26 ff.

[4] 1 Kings ii. 19 ; Gen. ix. 23 ; (Lam. iv. 16).

incompatible with dishonesty, deceit, breach of faith, lawlessness, and violence.[1] On the one hand, it is strengthened by clan feeling;[2] on the other, under the name of hospitality, it has to do with foreigners, and as sympathy and charity, it treats defenceless strangers kindly.[3] Hence in Israel, from the earliest days, "kindly" conduct was looked upon quite as a matter of course.[4] And although an ideal conception of true morality, without reference to definite divine commandments or divine rewards, such as is found in Proverbs xxxi., and especially in Job xxix. 12 ff., and xxxi., cannot be presupposed in ancient Israel, nevertheless it is a fact that, in order to lead a respectable life among this people, and be, as regards religion, a worthy citizen, a man had to be scrupulously faithful, honest, and honourable.[5] For it is the peculiarity of this religion that a proper relation to Jehovah was considered to depend absolutely on moral integrity. The will of this God was expressed in the grand fundamental requirements of morality.

Side by side with these main features of the morality which the Israelite knew that his religion made obligatory on him, the people in the olden times attached very great importance to a number of popular customs of a religious kind, such as purifications, festivals, sacrifices, the Sabbath, circumcision, and special rules as to food. Both kinds of conduct were regarded as equally binding on every one who wished to prove himself a true son of Israel.

Now this combination involves a risk. Most people are only too prone to confine themselves to matters of outward legality, and to overlook, in the affairs of daily life, the

[1] Gen. xx. 9; 2 Sam. xii. 5; 1 Sam. xxv. 31, xxviii. 10; cf. Gen. xvi. 6; Deut. xvi. 18 ff.; Ps. x. 7, xii. 3, xv. xxiv. 3 ff., lxxxii. xciv. 6; Prov. iii. 27-30, xxii. 22.

[2] Gen. xiii. 8 ff., xiv. 14.

[3] Gen. xix. 6 ff.; Judg. xix. 23 (the honour of virgins was of less account).

[4] Lev. xxiii. 22; Deut. x. 18, xiv. 28; Num. xv. 16 f.

[5] Gen. xxix. 26, xxxiv. 7, cf. xxxi. 32; Josh. ix. 17-21, etc.

troublesome barriers of morality. Hence the prophets could not remain content with preaching such easy-going doctrine. They had to insist that the outward legality that finds expression in religious customs is not in itself true morality at all; and that in fact, if kept up in this one-sided fashion, it might actually result in a deterioration of the moral life, and become an insult to God. They had to show that for God's people the true centre of the divine will was loyalty to religion, and the maintenance in daily life of justice, goodness, and truth; and that, in the eyes of God, sacred forms have absolutely no value, except as expressions of faith, humility, and obedience. Such is the burden of the prophetic messages from Amos and Hosea down to the Exile.

Hence prophecy leads away *from the form to the moral significance of the act*, away from the multiplicity of outward works to the unity of the inward disposition. Conduct is presented in a new light, as the necessary expression of a disposition truly loyal to the covenant, of believing submission to the God of goodness and truth. Even in those days there was certainly a tendency to give somewhat greater prominence to sacred form in the priestly sense, a tendency which finds classic expression in Ezekiel and A, and gets the upper hand after the time of Ezra—the inclination to exalt the outward act above the inward disposition, and that no longer with the naïve externality in vogue with the people, but in the conscious style of learned Pharisaism. In the prophetic and poetic monuments of the eighth and seventh centuries, however, this feature is thrown quite into the shade by the grand spirit of true morality. And even in many passages of the Thorah, especially in the laws contained in Exodus xxi.–xxiii. and in the "laws of holiness" in Leviticus, this spirit of genuine morality is revealed in a surprisingly beautiful fashion. The true morality of an act depends on the religious disposition out of which it springs. Certainly mere theoretical knowledge of God,—the crying "Lord, Lord,"—has nothing

to do with it, any more than "the fearing of God for hire."[1] But the truly religious disposition is the source of genuine morality. "To love the Lord thy God with all thine heart and with all thy soul, and with all thy might," is the fundamental commandment.[2] To be devoted to God, to trust Him,[3] look up to Him as a servant looks up to his master,[4] to fear Him,[5] to receive with humility His exhortations and warnings,[6] to be grateful to Him,[7] obedient and humble,[8]—for whosoever humbles himself need fear no humiliation,—such is the frame of mind which alone gives conduct its real value. This is in truth "to walk with God,"[9] "to live before Him."[10] Every one ought to glory in knowing God.[11] And whoever wishes to walk before God must "circumcise the foreskin of his heart,"[12] must dedicate his heart to God and keep it clean. He must write the law of God on his heart, and let it at the same time permeate his whole outer life.[13] Such a disposition will prevent Israel from overstepping the barriers of propriety, especially in sexual matters. God Himself takes vengeance on uncleanness, incest, and unchastity. The holy land is desecrated, for example, if by the divorcing of a wife and the taking of her back again after she has been married to another, the moral worth of marriage is destroyed;[14] if the blood of one who bears the "image of God" has been

[1] Hos. viii. 2; Job i. 9 ff.

[2] Deut. vi. 5 f., x. 12, xi. 1, 13, 22, xix. 9, xxx. 16, 20, xiii. 4 f.; Josh. xxii. 5, xxiii. 11; 1 Sam. xii. 24; 1 Kings viii. 23, xix. 10, 14; 2 Kings xxiii. 3; Ps. xcvii. 10, cxlv. 18 ff.

[3] B. J. xlii. 19 (מְשֻׁלָּם); Ps. xxxvii. 3.

[4] Ps. cxxiii. 1 f.

[5] Deut. iv. 10, vi. 2, 13, 24, v. 26, viii. 6, x. 12, xiv. 23, xxviii. 58, xxxi. 13; Ps. v. 8; Prov. iii. 7, etc. (Ps. xix. 10; xxxiv. 12; 2 Kings, xvii. 28. יראת יהוה is much the same as religion.)

[6] Isa. xxix. 15, 1 ff., 12 ff.

[7] Deut. i. 31, iv. 32, vi. 22, vii. 19, viii. 5, etc.

[8] Deut. x. 13, xi. 1, 32, xxvi. 16; Ps. cxix. 1, 2, 7, 8, 10, 176; cf. Deut. xviii. 17, ix. 4; B. J. xlii. 1 f.; Zeph. ii. 3, iii. 12 (עני).

[9] Prov. xxv. 6 ff., xxvii. 1, 2 (cf. Luke xiv. 8).

[10] Jer. ix. 23.

[11] Gen. v. 22, vi. 9, xvii. 1.

[12] Deut. x. 16.

[13] Deut. vi. 6 ff., xi. 18 ff.

[14] Jer. iii. 1, v. 9, ix. 9; Lev. xx.

unjustly shed, or if dishonesty and deceit defile the national life.[1]

This love to God has to manifest itself not in sacrifices, feasts, and outward acts, but by causing men in all their dealings with their fellows to act kindly and honourably, in harmony with the mind of God. To know God means nothing else than to practise justice and mercy.[2] At the exodus, when God laid down the conditions of the covenant, He did not speak of sacrifices, but of obedience and faithfulness.[3] True fasting means sympathy, almsgiving, and a bold, unflinching sense of justice.[4] Instead of festive assemblies, during which evil thoughts are indulged, God desires a humble and contrite heart, a mind full of joyful gratitude, charity to the poor and helpless, strict impartiality.[5] We may quote, in preference to everything else, the beautiful words of Micah: "He hath showed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?"[6] What the prophets in their sermons censure most, is harshness and cruelty, conduct which calls down God's wrath even on heathen peoples,[7] female wantonness and immorality,[8] debauchery and extravagance among the great,[9] misuse of the power of wealth,[10] commercial frauds on a

[1] Num. xxxv. 29–34; Judg. xx. 6, xxi. 1; Lev. xix. 15 ff., 35; Gen. ix. 4 ff.

[2] Jer. xxii. 16; Ezek. xviii. 5 ff.; Hos. iv. 1, vi. 6.

[3] Jer. v. 3, vii. 2 f., 21 (1 Sam. xv. 22). It is remarkable that in Ezekiel xx. 25 ff., a distinction is drawn between *the good law*, which God gave them at the very first when he entered into covenant with them (obviously the Decalogue), *and a law that was not good*, which He gave them as a punishment for breaking that good commandment. From Ezekiel's whole cast of thought he cannot well be thinking here of the ceremonial law, but of the bloody human sacrifices into which God allowed His people to fall by way of punishment.

[4] B. J. lviii. 6, 10; Prov. xxi. 3.

[5] Isa. i. 14 ff., xxxviii. 3; Ps. xl. 7, xli. 2, li. 19.

[6] Micah vi. 8; Hos. xii. 7; Deut. x. 12 ff.; Zech. vii. 6, viii. 16.

[7] Amos i. 3, 13, ii. 1.

[8] Amos iv. 1; Isa. iii. 16 ff.

[9] Amos iii. 10 f.; Isa. v. 11 ff.

[10] Isa. v. 8 ff., 21 ff., iii. 14, x. 1 ff.; Micah ii. 7 ff.; Jer. v. 26 ff.; Amos viii. 6; Deut. xxvii. 19.

confiding public,[1] and violence of every kind, especially in the administration of justice.[2] And they are never weary of insisting that the outward observance of religious form is absolutely valueless without the moral and religious spirit.[3]

3. Accordingly, so early as in Ex. xx.–xxiii., then in Deuteronomy, and in the admirable code of laws inserted by A in Lev. xix. ff., the Law itself places in the foreground, not individual claims and commandments, but the grand fundamental principles of morality, which make outward conduct depend directly on the inner life of the heart. The foundations of morality are the strictest integrity and faithfulness in every relation of life, especially in regard to marriage and in the administration of justice, and filial reverence for parents.[4] The verdict of an earthly judge is regarded as a sentence pronounced by the divine sovereign. All partiality in judging arouses the wrath of God.[5] The wantonness of false witness is restrained by an inexorable *jus talionis*.[6] False weights and the removing of landmarks are sternly punished.[7] But on this basis of justice we find also kindliness, sympathy for the poor, because Israel, too, was once poor and miserable,[8] humane treatment even of animals,[9] friendliness even towards strangers,[10] self-restraint even towards an enemy,[11] and love which covereth all transgressions.[12] The law of the middle books of the Thorah, like that of Deuteronomy, is altogether superior to the laws of other nations in high-toned humanity, fairness, and purity, and in abhorrence of dishonour, violence,

[1] Deut. xxv. 13 ; Amos viii. 5 ; Micah vi. 10 ff.

[2] Isa. v. 7 ff., 21 ff. ; Micah ii. 1 ; Amos iii. 10, v. 7 ff., vi. 12 ; Deut. xxvii. 17 ; Hos. vii. 1 ff.

[3] Isa. i. 14 ff.; B. J. lviii. 1 ff.; Jer. xi. 15 ; Zech. vii. 4 ff., etc.

[4] *E.g.* Deut. i. 16 f., xvi. 18 ff., xix. 14 f., 18 f., xxi. 15 ff., xxiii. 20 ff., xxiv. 1 ff., xxv. 5 ff., 13–16, xxii. 13–end ; cf. Prov. xx. 20, xxx. 17.

[5] Deut. i. 16 f., xvi. 18. [6] Deut. xix. 15 ff. [7] Deut. xxv. 13, xxvii. 17.

[8] Deut. xv. 7 ff., x. 18, xiv. 29, xxii. 1-5, 8, xxiv. 14, 17, 19 ff., xxvi. 12 ff. (xii. 12, 18, xvi. 11, 14). A right also of the stranger (Deut. i. 16).

[9] Deut. xxiv. 5–13, xxv. 3, 4, xxvi. 11, xxii. 6.

[10] Deut. x. 18, xii. 12, 18, xiv. 28 f., xvi. 11, 14 ; cf. Job xxxi. 15.

[11] Deut. xx. 10 ff., 19. [12] Prov. x. 12.

and roughness. Even the obligations of military service are limited by the right to certain enjoyments of life.[1] All needless cruelty is carefully avoided. As a punishment, death by torture is quite unknown.[2] Every species of fraud in trade and commerce is most rigorously forbidden,[3] especially usury, or the taking advantage to the utmost of the power over the poor which wealth gives, and, in general, all oppression of the defenceless.[4] Escaped slaves are not to be given up.[5] Every attempt to pervert justice is forbidden with special sternness, and even a gift to a judge—"for a present blindeth the wise."[6] Even the well-known saying, "Eye for eye, tooth for tooth," contains a demand for nothing more than the strictest rectitude in the courts of law.[7] In marriage legislation, due care is taken to prevent polygamy causing any unjust preferences.[8] Backbiting is forbidden, and all secret malice against a neighbour. A man is to be told his fault to his face.[9] The greatest attention is shown to the poor. In reality there should be no poor in Israel. But since there will always be some, they are commended to the care "of the charitable." Above all, widows and orphans are, in the most express terms, recommended as objects of charity, and secured against want by definite provisions—as, for example, those in regard to gleaning and the harvest of the Sabbatical year.[10] There are many stipulations indicative of humanity and piety.[11] The vineyard is not to be gleaned to the last grape, but

[1] Deut. xx. 5, xxiv. 5 ff.

[2] Ex. xxii. 2; Deut. xxv. 3. (Burning and impalement were practised only on the dead).

[3] Lev. xix. 11 f. 35.

[4] Ex. xxii. 25; Lev. xxv. 36 (נשך, מרבית); Deut. xv. 4, xxiv. 6, 18 ff., xxiii. 20, 25.

[5] Lev. xix. 15; Deut. xxiii. 15.

[6] Ex. xxiii. 2, 3, 6. (1 Sam. viii. 3, שחד.)

[7] Ex. xxi. 24 f.

[8] Deut. xxi. 15, xxii. 13 ff.

[9] Lev. xix. 16 f.

[10] Ex. xxiii. 10 ff.; Lev. xxv. 6; cf. Ex. xxii. 21 ff.; Deut. xxiv. 10 ff., 14 ff., xv. 4.

[11] Ex. xxi. 17, xxii. 27; cf. xx. 12; Lev. xviii. 18, xix. 13, 14, 32, xx. 9; Deut. xxvii. 18.

some are to be left for the poor and the stranger.[1] The wages of the labourer are not to be kept overnight.[2] A pledge is to be restored before nightfall, and nothing is to be taken as a pawn that is necessary for a livelihood.[3] It is a scandal to injure the defenceless and to lead the helpless astray.[4] There is to be no respect of persons; the poor are not to be placed at a disadvantage.[5] Respect is to be shown to age and station.[6] Even in the case of animals and plants a feeling of delicacy forbids any obliteration of natural divisions and of divinely ordained peculiarities.[7] Just as one is forbidden to build the roof of a house without a protecting parapet, one is also forbidden to disturb a brooding bird.[8] A desire for vengeance is to be repressed.[9] Carelessness that might endanger the life of a neighbour is sharply punished.[10] The possibility of a frivolous condemnation on the testimony of a single witness is carefully guarded against.[11] A slave is protected against his master's cruelty and sudden rage by very far-reaching regulations, although he certainly did not cease to be property, a live chattel.[12] Parental authority is most strongly emphasised.[13] Manstealing is punished with death.[14] A murderer is not protected even by the altar; but the cities of refuge prevent "the manslayer without evil intent" from falling a victim to the blood-avenger.[15] Slaves who receive a serious bodily injury must be set free.[16] And a slave, at least if a Hebrew, is presented with his freedom after serving a certain number of years.[17] In short, the sum of all these commandments is mercy and truth toward one's neighbour, one's

[1] Deut. xxiv. 19; Lev. xix. 9, xxiii. 22.
[2] Lev. xix. 13.
[3] Ex. xxii. 25; Deut. xxiv. 6, 12 f.
[4] Deut. xxvii. 18 f.; Lev. xix. 14.
[5] Ex. xxiii. 6; Lev. xix. 14.
[6] Ex. xxii. 27; Lev. xix. 32.
[7] Ex. xxiii. 19; Lev. xix. 14, xxii. 27; Deut. xx. 6.
[8] Deut. xxii. 6 ff.
[9] Lev. xix. 18.
[10] Ex. xxi. 28 f., 33 f., xxii. 5; Deut. xxii. 8.
[11] Num. xxxv. 30.
[12] Ex. xxi. 20 f.
[13] Deut. xxi. 18 f.
[14] Ex. xxi. 16.
[15] Ex. xxi. 13.
[16] Ex. xxi. 26.
[17] Deut. xv. 12 ff.

brother.[1] This is summed up in the sentence "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself."[2] In fact, Exodus xxiii. 4 f. rises to the thought that even in the case of a feud the simple duties of honesty and good-will are still binding. One must take back a strayed beast even to an enemy, and that, too, at the loss of one's time. And Proverbs xxv. 21 f. runs, "If thine enemy be hungry, give him bread to eat; and if he be thirsty, give him water to drink: for thou shalt heap coals of fire upon his head, and the Lord shall reward thee."

All this refers primarily to fellow-countrymen, "the servants of the God of thy father,"[3] to brethren, neighbours. But how is a stranger treated? A difference is always made. One Israelite stands to another in a closer relationship. Many things illegal as regards a fellow-Israelite are legal in the case of a stranger—as, for example, usury, slavery, etc.[4] But even as regards strangers, the spirit of the law is a highly magnanimous one. The stranger, in so far as he has become resident in Israel and has conformed to the national customs,[5] acquires certain rights, although, it is true, not equal rights. For instance, he cannot legally purchase landed property. But just because he is without property, he is commended all the more strongly to the charitable. There must be but one law and one ordinance for the stranger and for him that is born in the land.[6] The people are commanded again and again to show kindness and charity to strangers. The gleanings and the fruits of the Sabbatical year belong to them as well as to the Levites and the poor.[7] The Sabbath commandment itself is referred back to the need which slaves and strangers have of rest, to the memory of their own slavery in Egypt.[8] Indeed,

[1] עמית, Lev. v. 21, xix. 15, xxv. 17; אח, *e.g.* Lev. xxv. 35, 39.
[2] Lev. xix. 17 f.; cf. Gen. xviii. 23 ff. [3] Gen. l. 17.
[4] Ex. xxii. 25; Lev. xxv. 35; Deut. xv. 3, xxiii. 20; Ex. xxi. 1–11.
[5] גר. (The stranger within thy gates.)
[6] Num. ix. 14, xv. 15 f.; Lev. xxiv. 22.
[7] Ex. xxii. 21 f., xxiii. 9, 11; Lev. xix. 9, 10, 33, xxiii. 22; Deut. x. 19 (אהב).
[8] Ex. xxiii. 12; Deut. v. 14.

Lev. xix. 34 orders the people to love the stranger as they love themselves. Hence in many respects the morality of the Old Testament is a near approach to that of Christianity; and, in fact, it is to such passages from the law that both Jesus and His disciples are specially fond of attaching their exhortations. The kindness, humanity, and tenderness, shown alike to the children of Israel and to the strangers sojourning among them, and the conception of morality as the necessary expression of the frame of mind which results from piety, remind us of the New Testament. Nevertheless, "the principle of love is still confined to one people" (Ewald). Just as religion has its national limits, so morality does not yet deal with men as men without regard to their nationality.

For the foreigner proper, who is for Israel, as for the other nations of antiquity, essentially a "hostis," there exists another code of morality. Against Amalek and the enemies of the people the ban is relentlessly launched. And even the age of the prophets did not beat down these barriers. There are several peoples whose good they are commanded not to seek.[1] With the growing misery of Israel, and the increasing hostility of the neighbour peoples, the desire gets intensified to see in their own enemies the enemies of God. Hence A represents the aboriginal inhabitants of Canaan as all alike doomed by God to utter extermination. The desire of the congregation for revenge, for the damnation of their enemies, is due partly to the intensity of their zeal for the kingdom of God, and partly to natural passion. "Do not I hate them, O Lord, that hate Thee? Yea, I hate them with perfect hatred."[2]

Still it must not be forgotten that, on the whole, previous to the Exile, hatred of foreigners and the particularistic view of morality never prevailed to anything like the same extent as

[1] Deut. xxiii. 4, 7, xxv. 17.

[2] Ps. xxviii. 4, xxxv. 1, lviii. 11 f., lix. 6, lxiii. 10 f., lxix 22 f., lxx. 3, lxxi. 13, 24, civ. 35, cix. 6–15, 19 f., cxxix. 4 f., cxxxix. 21 f.

in the Levitical period. Although in B, as well as in A, great stress is laid on not marrying Canaanitish women,[1] it is frankly stated that Judah, Joseph, and Moses married wives belonging to other nations. The book of Ruth lets a Moabitess appear as a worthy ancestress of David.[2] Early legend represents certain heathen personages as so worthy and honourable, that they come very close to the patriarchs of Israel.[3] And in the same way the indignation of Amos at the cruelty practised on the king of Edom,[4] the large-hearted sympathy of the Deuteronomist for Edom and Egypt,[5] the inclusion too of other nations in Solomon's beautiful intercessory prayer,[6] and the universalistic hopes of the future expressed by Isaiah[7] and others, show that the seeds of a really humane disposition were by no means lacking in Israel. In the book of Job, the pious hero is a foreigner belonging to the land of Uz, although his portrait is bright with all the colours of patriarchal piety. And in the patriarchal legend the figures of Melchizedek and Abimelech show an unmistakable superiority to purely national limitations. In fact, when Israel is called *the first-born of God*,[8] the phrase is, indeed, primarily meant to express His preference for this people; but it is also an acknowledgment of the importance which the other peoples have in the eyes of God.

Such are the main points in the Law which are of religious importance. The Law always does its best to change the popular custom into conformity with the principles of equity, generosity, and truth. Even the avenging of blood is robbed of its most terrible features, and placed under definite regulations.[9] The relations of the sexes are purified and

[1] Gen. xxiv. 3, xxvi. 34, xxvii. 46, xxviii. 1.

[2] Gen. xxxviii. 2, 6, xli. 45, 50; Ex. ii. 20; Num. xii. 1; Ruth i. 4, 22, ii. 2, 6, 10, 21, iv. 5, 10, 17.

[3] *E.g.* Gen. xiv., xx., xlvi. 1 ff. (narratives such as xix. 30 ff. are perhaps of a later date).

[4] Amos ii. 1. [5] Deut. ii. 5, 8 ff., xxiii. 8. [6] 1 Kings viii. 41.

[7] Isa. xix. 23. [8] Ex. iv. 22; Jer. xxxi. 7 ff.

[9] Ex. xxi. 12 f.; Num. xxxv. 16 ff.; Deut. xix. 2 ff.; Josh. xx. 1.

softened by the stern prohibition of incest and all unnatural abominations, and by the strict protection of female honour and marriage rights.[1] Old national customs are modified when they no longer accord with the gentler spirit of the age, as, for instance, marriage with a deceased husband's brother, which was probably a right originally fixed by custom, and which brought in its train many objectionable consequences, such as incest.[2] It is legally binding only on an unmarried brother,[3] more distant relatives being, at the most, under nothing more than a moral obligation.[4] It thus becomes a kindly method of providing, as far as possible, for a widow who has no son to support her. In the emphasising of the duty and importance of religious instruction which is so often sharply insisted on;[5] in the strengthening of the marriage tie by the prohibition of marriage with near relatives, a prohibition of which it is clear that Hebrew antiquity knew nothing;[6] in transferring the duty of punishing a murderer from the family to the people, as the executor of the holy will of God, who cannot allow the land to be polluted;[7] and in securing the position of a wife in so far as that could be done consistently with the already existing right of divorce,[8]—in all this we see an earnest endeavour to establish, on a religious basis, a society that would be strictly moral in its relations. And in the joyful

[1] Unchastity is looked on as shame and pollution, Lev. xviii. 22, 23, 27 f., xx. 10 ff. (Lev. xix. 29). Naturally all the abominations of Hamite unchastity are forbidden as contrary to "the holiness of God."

[2] The יבם is, according to Gen. xxxviii. 12 ff., a right which is stronger than the prohibition against incest, just as we catch a glimpse in xix. 30 ff. of the view that a family is to be kept up at all hazards.

[3] So Deut. xxv. 5-7 (living together, in which case, therefore, the younger brother is unmarried).

[4] So Ruth iii. 9, iv. 5 ff. (to take off the shoe, originally, perhaps, "to give up one's right," in Deut. xxv. 9, meant as an insult).

[5] Gen. xviii. 19; Ex. xii. 20, xiii. 14; Deut. vi. 20 (Prov. x. 1, xvii. 21, xix. 13, xxiii. 13 f., 24).

[6] Gen. xx. 12; 2 Sam. xiii. 13 (cf. also Gen. xxix. 23, 30, with Lev. xviii. 18).

[7] Gen. ix. 5 f.; Num. xxxv. 33; cf. Ps. ix. 13; Gen. iv. 10; Job xix. 25; cf. also Ex. xxi. 16; Deut. xxiv. 7 (man-stealing).

[8] Deut. xxii. 19, 29, xxiv. 1 ff.

attachment to the national life and its institutions,[1] in the healthy natural regard for wife and children, as well as for true friends,[2] we see the favourable aspects of that close relationship between religion and national life for which the Old Testament is distinguished.

4. In the morality of the Old Testament, it is true, we soon observe the interpretation against which the true prophets struggled, and which Christianity overcame. Since the days of the Deuteronomist the chief requirements of morality are no longer regarded as the outflow of the divine will, to which every pious person submits as a matter of course, but become, to a greater and greater degree, "statutes, judgments, and commandments" of God which one has to obey in the anxious spirit of a servant.[3] Nor is it only the general favour of God that is, in an increasing measure, thought of as depending on obedience to His ordinances, as, for example in Isa. iii. 10; but divine recompense is made, in a fashion more and more external, the ruling motive of moral conduct.[4] Finally, after the Exile the place of morality, as the main requirement of God, is usurped more and more by external acts of worship. This is so even with the Isaiah of the Exile, as compared with the older prophets.[5] And the contrast is still stronger in Daniel, Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah.[6] And Ecclesiastes, too, although in another way, is purely eudæmonistic in thought, and inquires only after what gives "true

[1] *E.g.* Prov. xvi. 12–15, xx. 8–26, xxv. 5, xxix. 4, 8, xiv. 34.

[2] Prov. ii. 17, the covenant of God, xix. 14, xii. 4, xviii. 22, xxxi. 10 ff.; Cant. vi. 8 f., viii. 6; Ps. cxxvii., cxxviii. (1 Sam. xx. 23).

[3] Gen. xxvi. 5; Ex. xvi. 28, xviii. 16, 20; Lev. xviii. 1–3; Num. xv. 39 ff.; Deut. iv. 1, v. 26, vi. 1; Josh. i. 7, xxii. 4, xxiii. 6, xxv., xxvi.; 1 Kings ii. 1, iii. 14, xxiii. 3; Isa. xxiv. 5, xlii. 24; Ps. cv. 26, cvi. 3.

[4] *E.g.* Gen. xix. 19, xxvi. 28, xxx. 27, xxxix. 3; Lev. xxvi. 3 ff.; Deut. iv. 1, vi. 8, vii. 11, viii. 1, 19, xxvi. 16 ff., xxviii. 1 ff.; 1 Sam. xii. 14 ff., xxvi. 23 (cf. Ps. i.; 1 Kings ii. 1, iii. 14, etc.).

[5] B. J. xlii. 24, xliii. 22, xliv. 1, 14, 22, xlvi. 12, xlvii. 6, xlviii. 1, 8, lxv. 21, lxvi. 9, li. 1, 7 (on the other hand, lvi. 1, lvii. 1, lviii. 1 ff., lix. 1).

[6] Dan. i. 8, iii. 16–18, 29, vi. 11 ff. 26 (cf. iv. 24, ix. 5 ff., x. 12); 1 Chron. x. 13, xiii. 7, 21, xxii. 13; 2 Chron. xv. 8, xxv. 14, xxvi. 16; cf. xvii. 4 ff., 9 ff., xxxi. 21; Ezra i., ii., viii. 21, ix. 3, 6, 23; Neh. xiii. 14, 18 ff.

happiness." In this way the Old Testament points the way to Pharisaism and Eudæmonism.

CHAPTER IV.

THE HOLINESS OF THE PEOPLE IN RELATION TO THE OUTER FORM OF EXISTENCE. THE CEREMONIAL LAW.

LITERATURE.—Sommer, *Biblische Abhandlungen*, i. 183 ff. Knobel (Dillmann), *Commentar zum Exodus und Leviticus*. Spencer, *l.c.*, 35–188, 241–268, 483–545. Lisco, *Das Ceremonialgesetz des Alten Testamentes. Darstellung desselben und Nachweis seiner Erfüllung im Neuen Testamente*, Berlin 1842. Hengstenberg, "Das Ceremonialgesetz" (*Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, Bd. iii., 1839). For the Greeks, cf. Hermann, *l.c.*, 125. Schömann, *l.c.*, ii. 192, 349, 409. For the Ssabians, cf. Chwolsohn, ii. 10, 445, 483. On the laws regarding food, Saalschütz, *l.c.*, i. 251 ff. Bruno Bauer, *l.c.*, 255. Ewald, *Alterthümer*, 194 ff.

1. The ceremonial law of Israel lies before us as a harmonious, organically connected form of life. How many centuries contributed to its formation, when the last and most delicate touches were given, how long an interval elapsed between the laying down of the simplest commandments, abstinence from blood, and circumcision, and the completion of the details as to clean and unclean meats—all this is hid from our view by an impenetrable veil. But we shall certainly not be wrong in regarding the material out of which this whole masterpiece has been wrought—that is, the most of the habits and customs—as very old, far older than the Old Testament religion. No other theory will explain a mass of details, for which it would be vain to seek a true reason in the religion of Moses himself. And it is

natural to suppose that in Israel, as among the other nations of the ancient East, such customs would not alter even before a new religion, but would at the most accommodate themselves to it as plastic material, though, in many cases, cross-grained and hard to assimilate.

If we take this peculiarity of the material for granted, the idea which the spirit of religion has embodied in it, stands out before us in grander proportions than ever, and more logically consistent. In all the surroundings of the life of this divinely-consecrated holy people, the divine life has to find expression. Hence, everything brings us back again to the inmost essence of this God Himself, to His holiness.[1] Whatever is out of harmony with the dignity of the people dedicated to such a God must be absolutely excluded. Hence the ceremonial law, even in its smallest details, presents itself with the same religious claims as the moral law. Disobedience to it entails death. Israel is the holy people, the people which God hallows, which He has chosen from the womb and called, and in which He is Himself hallowed before other nations.[2] Hence it becomes this people to have a special mode of life, and also, in regard to its outward national life, a sacred purity such as is not imposed on other peoples; just as in the camp, in which the divine presence abides, nothing filthy or unclean can have a place.[3] Hence "the statutes and the judgments of God," which regulate this outward life of the people, are the conditions on which He is well pleased with His people, the holy garment, as it were, of the people's life in which Israel alone can draw near to this God of his in a becoming manner.

[1] Lev. xi. 45, xix. 2 ff., xx. 7, 26, xxi. 8; cf. Lev. xviii. 24–28. It is precisely these chapters, dating probably from the early years of the Exile, which are pre-eminently distinguished, not only for grandeur of meaning, but for creative power as well.

[2] Deut. vii. 6, xiv. 2, 21, xxvi. 18, xxvii. 9, xxviii. 9 f., xxix. 12, xxxii. 9; Ezek. xx. 12, 41, xxviii. 22, 25, xxxvii. 28, xxxviii. 23, xxxix. 27; Hos. xi. 1; cf. Deut. iv. 1, 14, v. 28, etc. (God is Israel's מקדישׁ, Lev. xxii. 32).

[3] Deut. xxiii. 15.

Hence it is easily understood that on the one hand the Old Testament ceremonial law has, in many points, a great affinity with similar customs among other peoples, especially with those of the Greeks and the Romans, and partly also with those of the Zend race and the Egyptians. This is explained, not only from its being founded on popular customs which are naturally akin to those of other nations, but also from the fact that certain views of holiness, uncleanness, life, and death are found among many of the higher peoples of antiquity. But it is likewise easily understood how, on the other hand, this same law, as a whole and taken as an ideal, is absolutely unique, and how it should develop a specially sharp antagonism to the worship of nature practised by the neighbouring Hamite peoples. It must, in fact, be hostile to such worship, just as the religion of the holy, living God is hostile to the orgiastic worship of the powers of nature. The worship of nature draws the divine down into the processes of nature and interweaves it with them. This law seeks to hallow and purify these processes of nature, in order to draw them up to God. The worship of nature seeks to honour the Deity by absolute submission to nature with its instincts, forces, sufferings, and movements. Death and procreation are for it the mysterious centres of religious contemplation. This law wishes to honour the Creator of life, who is exalted high above nature, by making everything natural surrender itself unreservedly to Him; while whatever cannot accommodate itself to Him, and cannot enter into His life, is excluded and annihilated.

In giving this explanation of the ceremonial law, it is not denied that there may also have been subordinate motives at work. Thus, considerations of health may lie at the foundation of many of the commandments as to food; for sickness is considered, from the stand-point of religion, a violation of an Israelite's holiness, and the prophetic and priestly

calling was in Israel as frequently combined with the medical as among other ancient peoples.[1] But still that is only one side of the religious conception, and certainly not a very important one. In the same way the numerous restrictive regulations may have been intended to exclude Israel from intercourse with the neighbouring peoples. Indeed, it is said by God in so many words: "I have separated you from among the peoples."[2] But, on the one hand, these words express only the feeling of a late age; and, on the other, it must not be forgotten that such barriers were not the result of deliberate State policy, but a natural consequence of the religious thought of Israel's election by God, and its separation from the rest of the profane race of man. God separates His people from the other peoples, because in serving strange gods these others give themselves up to abominable immoralities. Besides, it is not to be overlooked that other ancient peoples too, as for example the Egyptians,[3] had a definite mode of life, quite peculiar to themselves, which grew up out of their religion, and consequently kept them apart from strangers. The principles at the foundation of the ceremonial law are thoroughly religious.

The prominence given to this side of Israel's holiness was very different at different periods of the Old Testament. In the earliest age, Israel, like all religiously inclined peoples of antiquity, attached very great importance to such holiness, not in obedience to a written law, but in accordance with the religious consciousness of the people, who regarded it as

[1] *E.g.* Lev. xiv. 2 ff., 33 ff. There are also police regulations connected with it, as in Deut. xxiii. 14. But even these are referred to the fundamental thought that this people belongs to God, and that God is present in the midst of it.

[2] הבדיל, Lev. xviii. 1 ff., xx. 26.

[3] Tertullian's utterance in *Praescr. Haer.* xl. is interesting. "Si Numae Pompilii superstitiones revolvamus, si sacerdotalia officia et insignia et privilegia, si sacrificalia ministeria et instrumenta et vasa ipsorum sacrificiorum et piaculorum et votorum curiositates consideremus, nonne manifeste diabolus morositatem illam judaïcae legis imitatus est?"

indicating their consecration as a people to Jehovah. Even for Amos a heathen country is an unclean land.[1]

The great prophets, however, attached very little importance to this whole aspect of holiness. Of course they never meant to encourage any disloyalty to the sacred customs of Israel. Amos, for example, censures the covetousness which would willingly turn the feast days into working days. Hosea considers that food different from Israel's is unclean.[2] But, on the whole, it is true morality and the piety of the heart which these men keep mainly in view. And although Deuteronomy also defines and insists on[3] these holy forms, it nevertheless pays most attention to the moral side of the law. We may put it thus: From Amos till the Exile the men of God emphasise sacred forms only incidentally, and especially in cases where their violation might be regarded as showing a tendency to the worship of strange gods, or as culpable selfishness and indifference.[4]

After Deuteronomy those inclined, from priestly habit and natural temperament, to follow out this line of things find themselves more and more strongly impelled to emphasise and elaborate the external holiness of Israel. This is specially the case with Ezekiel. He busies himself with the ritual of the new Jerusalem. Even in a vision he cannot reconcile himself to the thought of unclean meat.[5] It is the same with the great priestly law-giver, A. And, during the Exile, faithful observance of the sacred forms which it was possible to observe beyond the confines of Palestine, especially in regard to food and the Sabbath, became the mark of that true Israel

[1] Amos vii. 17.

[2] Amos iv. 5, viii. 5 ; Hos. ix. 3 f.

[3] Deut. x. 5, xii., xiv. 1–23, xv. 1 ff., xvi. 1–18, xvii. 1, xix., xxii. 5–11, xxiii. 2 f., 10–18.

[4] Prov. iii. 9 ff.; Isa. viii. 19 ; Jer. xvii. 19, 21 ; 2 Kings xx. 3. Also in Job i. 5 it is represented as a specially praiseworthy feature that the pious man himself offers sacrifices to atone for sins which it is just possible his children may have committed.

[5] Ezek. iv. 14, xx. 12, 21, xxii. 8, 26, xliv. 31, etc.

which was determined not to be absorbed into the heathen world, but to survive, as a faithful covenant people, the death of Israel. Hence even the great exilic prophet lays stress on such things as acknowledged marks of the servant of Jehovah,[1] though in other respects his attention is strenuously directed to the inward character of the religious life. Those who returned home naturally shared in this loyalty to sacred form, and even in the tendency to exaggerate its importance, which the superabundance of priestly elements was already causing, and in the desire to increase the people's claims to holiness, as for instance in the case of an oath.[2] Since Ezra, the predominance of this tendency is very marked.

2. The natural course of human life, as known by actual experience, appears to the completed law as not sufficiently healthy, pure, and honourable, to enter into fellowship with the divine life of "holiness." In comparison with the latter, all material created life is faulty and defective. The flesh is not worthy of God. Washing and purification are, therefore, necessary preliminaries to every holy act. Circumcision is meant to give symbolical expression to the thought that the source of life must be consecrated before a pure people of God can arise. A mother must be purified after childbirth. Her illness and uncleanness are looked at from the standpoint of a divine curse.[3] In fact, she remains twice as long unclean after bearing a female child as after bearing a son; and that, I should say, not merely from "the idea of a longer illness after the birth of a girl," but especially because the female nature and everything connected therewith is to be thought of as still less worthy of approaching God than is the male.[4] Generation itself is regarded as something which

[1] B. J. lvi. 3–6, lviii. 13, lxv. 4 f., lxvi. 17; Ps. li. 20 f.; Lam. i. 4, ii. 6.

[2] In Hos. iv. 15 it is only in the mouth of idolaters that the oath is represented as an insult to God. On the other hand, in Ezek. v. 3, Eccles. ix. 2, an oath is regarded as in itself objectionable.

[3] Gen. iii. 16; cf. Lev. xii. 1–8.

[4] This is implied in the fact that Eve is seduced first; cf. later Eccles. vii. 29.

entails purification. Sommer, it is true, has questioned this. He wishes to take the passages where שִׁכְבַת זֶרַע is spoken of, as referring to involuntary seminal pollution, such as would come under the category of discharge, purulent matter, self-pollution.[1] But even if that were possible in the passages quoted, which in my opinion is not the case, especially because of שָׁכַב with the accusative in Lev. xv. 18, and also because of the parallel passages, still 1 Sam. xxi. 5–7 and Ex. xix. 15 show plainly enough that even conjugal intercourse was thought to render a person unfit to enjoy the higher privileges of the sanctuary; and 2 Sam. xi. 4 is a remarkable proof that this view, being deeply rooted in the popular imagination, was deferred to, even where heinous sin was not avoided. Accordingly, natural life in its most critical moments is held to be unconsecrated, that is, incapable of entering without purification into fellowship with holiness. Whosoever looks on God must die.[2]

But everything is specially unholy which suggests decomposition, dissolution, and decay, and above all whatever has any connection with death. This may indeed be partly due to the invariably loathsome accompaniments of decomposition. But the main point is the antagonism between this God and death.[3] God is life, absolutely independent, inviolable life. It is not seemly that persons, consecrated to this "living" God, should come into contact with death. Everything, even in inanimate nature, that furthers putrefaction, such as honey and leaven, is excluded from strictly sacred uses. These may doubtless be offered as products of nature, as first-fruits, because they are in them-

[1] Lev. xv. 16–18, 24, xxii. 4; cf. for the idiom Lev. xx. 18, 20. Irregular or unnatural sexual acts are of course represented as direct violations of holiness (Deut. xxiii. 1, 18, xxvii. 20 f.).

[2] Ex. xxxiii. 20; Judg. vi. 13; Isa. vi.

[3] Perhaps this accounts also for the unholiness of iron, as being that which cuts and kills. No iron is to be used at the building of an altar, or of the temple (Ex. xx. 25; 1 Kings vi. 7).

selves, like all other products of the earth, gifts of divine goodness.[1] But from sacrifice proper they are absolutely excluded; whereas in every sacrifice there must be salt as a preventive of putrefaction.[2] In regard to animals, the unholiness of the dead is emphasised still more strongly. Every beast that dies of itself, or is torn in pieces, is unclean.[3] No one may use it as food except a stranger who is not a member of the holy congregation.[4] Nay more, everything which such a carcase has touched becomes unclean, except of course what is excluded by the nature of the case.[5] It is easily understood that the carcases of unclean beasts should be doubly unclean. But even the carcase of a clean beast bears this character.[6]

A human corpse is more unclean than anything else. The higher the development of life rises, the more prominent does everything abnormal become. Contact with a corpse makes every Israelite incapable of sharing in the rights and duties of the holy people until he has been purified, as the law prescribes.[7] Now the priest, being in a special sense consecrated to God, must not profane his holiness by taking part in a burial, except in a very few cases of pressing emergency.[8] The high priest dare not do so, even in the case of his father or mother.[9] The vow of a Nazirite is null and void as soon as he comes into contact with a dead body.[10] A corpse pollutes a holy place.[11] Hence the prophet Ezekiel regards it as a grievous desecration of the temple that the kings of Judah are allowed to be buried in it.[12] The corpses of the

[1] Lev. ii. 12, xxxiii. 27; cf. vii. 12.
[2] Ex. xxiii. 18, xxxiv. 25; Lev. ii. 4–8, 11 (Salt, Lev. ii. 13, but perhaps as a symbol of the covenant).
[3] נבלה טרפה, Ex. xxii. 30; Lev. xxvii. 15, xxii. 8. [4] Deut. xiv. 21.
[5] The laws in Lev. xi. 36 f. (*e.g.* seed is an exception).
[6] Lev. xi. 8, 24, 27, 31; cf. 39; Deut. xiv. 8, 21.
[7] Num. v. 2, vi. 6, ix. 6, 10, xix. 13 ff., xxxi. 19.
[8] Lev. xxi. 2 ff. (where there is no other natural guardian).
[9] Lev. xxi. 11. [10] Num. vi. 7. [11] 2 Kings xxiii. 13, 14.
[12] Ezek. xliii. 7–9.

impaled are considered to pollute the land in quite an exceptional manner.[1]

If death is the complete dissolution of the individual life into its atoms, the decomposition of the body, then sickness is the same for separate parts of this life. Hence every kind of sickness is unclean. The ailments of the female nature are connected with sin and death.[2] The ailments of sexual life in general, the ordinary[3] as well as the extraordinary,[4] cause uncleanness, and make the person unholy. Hence the priest must be without blemish, without any sign of sickness.[5] A sacrificial victim must be the same, at least when the festive meal is not the chief thing.[6] And since uncleanness and the curse inherent in sickness are nowhere manifested in such a visible and terrible form as in leprosy in all its varieties, this disease is the one that makes a person utterly unclean. As a sign of the curse it drives the sufferer out of the congregation. Only after solemn purification and re-consecration does he become fit to take part in the services of the sanctuary.[7]

[1] Deut. xxi. 23. (It is probably due to the same idea that no iron tool must be used upon a sanctuary, Ex. xx. 25).

[2] Gen. iii. 16 f.

[3] Lev. xii. 1–7, xv. 16–25.

[4] Lev. xv. 1 ff., 25 ff.; Num. v. 2 ff.

[5] Lev. xxi. 17 ff.

[6] Lev. i. 3, 10, iii. 1, iv. 3, ix. 2, etc.

[7] Lev. xiii., xiv.; cf. Job and B. J. liii. In the camp in which the holy God dwells, no such sick person dare remain (Num. v. 2 f.). It is certain that in this whole view there is a sharp antagonism to the customs of the Hamite religion, which were closely connected with necromancy, and perhaps even with the worship of the dead. But even apart from the fact that this was not an old Israelitish custom but a Canaanitish, Stade may be considered as going beyond the limits of what can be proved when he regards almost the whole of the domain with which we are now dealing as a reaction against the worship of the dead and of ancestors. "Whatever has any connection with the worship of the dead or of ancestors, the dead man's house, grave, corpse; whatever is affected with disease, or has to do with functions which are under the guardianship of particular spirits; all animals which certain tribes regarded as their ancestors, all solemnities which have any connection with ancestral worship, are unclean. Hence, too, a heathen land is unclean." There is not a single passage in all the Old Testament which suggests that the upholders of Jehovah's religion felt that they were struggling, not against the worship of Baal and Ashtoreth, but against the worship of ancestors. In every instance, necromancy is only a single feature of foreign customs (Isa. viii.; 1 Sam. xxviii.).

From this point of view, not a few processes of nature are unclean. But, being natural, they are still the expression of the divine will. Hence the uncleanness is increased when this nature, which should develop in a healthy way, is mutilated, misused, or perverted. This is specially true of sexual relations. Castration,—in the religion of nature a consenting to the death of nature,—is strictly forbidden, even in the case of animals.[1] The abominable unnatural unions with which the worship of nature likewise celebrates the mysteries of natural growth and decay, compelled the land of Canaan to spue out its inhabitants.[2] They are punished with the utmost severity and firmness.[3] They would make even Israel so unworthy of God's holy land as to be driven out. The very symbols which usually accompanied such worship are not tolerated.[4] Thus, in reference to what was then customary among Asiatic peoples, Deuteronomy forbids men to wear women's clothes, and *vice versâ*, because these were the symbols behind which the initiated concealed their profligacy at the festivals of nature-worship.[5] Akin to this is the law against the intermarriage of blood relations, which testifies to an abhorrence of an unseemly intermixture of two moral relationships.[6]

The general rule is that nothing is to be permitted which is contrary to a delicate sense of the inviolable proprieties of nature. To kill an animal too young, while still sucking, or to kill it and its mother together, is against the finer instincts of nature.[7] To sow different kinds of seed together, to yoke different animals together, is an unnatural conjunction of what nature has separated.[8] Man himself must not attempt

[1] Lev. xxii. 24. [2] Lev. xviii. 21 ff., 28, xx. 23 ff.
[3] Ex. xxii. 18; Lev. xviii. 22 ff., xx. 13, 15 (Ex. xxii. 15; Lev. xviii. 6 ff., xix. 29; Num. xxv. 1 ff.; 1 Kings xiv. 24, xv. 12).
[4] Lev. xviii. 28; cf. xx. 23. [5] Deut. xiv. 1 ff., xxii. 5.
[6] Lev. xviii. 6 ff., xx. 11 ff.; Deut. xxvii. 20 ff.
[7] Ex. xxiii. 19, xxxiv. 26; Lev. xxii. 28.
[8] Lev. xix. 19; Deut. xxii. 9–11.

any unnatural changes or improvements of his own person. However freely wine is used, and however little is thought of drinking to excess, still, at the moment of his holy dedication, a priest must not excite himself by strong drink.[1] Artificial marks, baldness, wounds, such as the priests of the nature-goddess inflicted on themselves, are forbidden to members of the holy congregation.[2] The people of the holy God are expected to enjoy unarrested development, and, as far as possible, perfect health and strength. Any bodily injury makes a man still more unworthy of the great God than he already is in himself, owing to his weak physical nature. The religion of nature may also become the religion of decaying, dying nature, and take part in the process of death. But the Old Testament religion is the religion of absolutely perfect life, the religion of the living God.[3]

3. It is most difficult to understand the laws of Mosaism about food, for they have come down to us in two not altogether consistent forms.[4] Even here, it is true, the ground thought is easily recognisable. These laws are based at once on the holiness of God and the holiness of the people. Hence the animals that are not to be eaten must be regarded as in some way unclean, and therefore as unsuitable for those who are to be "the holy people" of the holy God.[5] But here, just because the most of the arrangements rest, of course, on primitive popular customs, it is difficult to say exactly why the particular animals are looked upon as clean or unclean.

The foundations of such dietetic customs are already laid, according to the view of Genesis as we now have it, in very early days. In Paradise, according to B, man has no food but the fruit of trees.[6] After his expulsion, he is given the fruits of

[1] Lev. x. 9.

[2] Lev. xix. 28, xxi. 5, xxii. 24; Deut. xiv. 1, xxiii. 2.

[3] The figure of the Nazirite was an expression of such thoughts in the original exuberance of antiquity.

[4] Lev. xi.; Deut. xiv. 3-22. [5] Lev. xi. 43-45. [6] Gen. ii. 16.

the ground.[1] Henceforward, also, the use of flesh seems to have been allowed. For, being a shepherd, Abel already sacrifices the firstlings of his flock.[2] Later on, too, no mention is made, after the flood, of flesh being sanctioned as food; and yet "clean and unclean" beasts go into the ark.[3] As is his wont, the narrator C puts primitive food customs into the mythical legends of patriarchal times.[4] According to A, who also does his best to make it appear that the sacred customs of Israel originated very early indeed, the vegetable world seems to have supplied antediluvian man with all his food.[5] Man is given the fruit of trees and vegetables, the animals are given the green herbage; no living thing is given as food either to man or beast. Then after the flood, the animals too are given as food to the new race of men.[6] But a strict exception is made of the blood, the organ of the soul.[7] This regulation is not so much directed against the barbarous custom of using living animals as food, although, in another place, the people require to be restrained from a barbarity and greed going even as far as that.[8] It rather refers to the fact that the blood, as God's property in nature, must not be put to ordinary use as food, a view which also runs through other parts of the law.[9]

Thus the later laws about food spring in Israel's view and no doubt also according to historical fact, from the very same roots as the oldest popular customs. What then are the real reasons for these customs? To ascribe them to dietetic reasons, to reaction against Egyptian habits, to pædagogic objects (such as isolation), to allegorical views, etc., is only to skim the surface of the phenomenon. To ascribe them

[1] Gen. iv. 2, 3. [2] Gen. iv. 2, 4, 20.
[3] Gen. vii. 2, 8, viii. 20. [4] Gen. xxxii. 33. [5] Gen. i. 29.
[6] Gen. ix. 3. [7] Gen. ix. 4 f.
[8] In 1 Sam. xiv. 32; it is the disgusting eagerness to eat the pieces of flesh while still bloody which the king is just in time to prevent as sin against God (ver. 33); cf. *Odyss.* xx. 348.
[9] Lev. xvii. 10, xix. 26; cf. iii. 17, vii. 23, 25, 26 (the fat, because it is the part sacrificed).

to foreign influences—as, for instance, to Persian customs, is right only thus far, that similar customs, springing from similar thoughts and ideas, have grown up among many other peoples. Besides, there is, as Sommer has already rightly seen, a distinct difference between the idea of dividing animals into those belonging to the good power, and those belonging to the bad, —a division which the Avesta presupposes, and which leads to the religious command to hunt down the latter class,— and the Hebrew idea that all animals are created by God,[1] but are not all clean, and that the unclean are not to be touched at all. The explanation from the position which particular animals had in ancestral worship is at once contradicted by the fact that names like Rachel (ewe) are just those of clean beasts.[2]

There can be no question about the accuracy of the general principle which Ewald and Sommer lay down, viz. that popular custom was the deciding factor. Everything vegetable was in itself clean. But, of the animals, those that had been regularly used as food in Israel from the days of old, were taken as normal examples of "the clean." These suggested the marks which were then transferred to what was merely analogous. Animals that had not these were rejected. When the marks changed, the law could change too. Thus in Deuteronomy the locust is not reckoned among the animals that are to be eaten, whereas A's legislation adds it to them.[3] These are certainly the ground ideas.

It is very easily understood that all animals are excluded which live on blood and on carrion. To them is transferred the uncleanness which attaches to the carcase, or which results from feasting on blood. Thus there are animals for which every properly constituted person has an instinctive

[1] Gen. i. 21, 24 (רמשׂ).

[2] Cf. also animals, as in Lev. xi. 7, 10, 22, 29 f., which certainly had no connection with ancestral worship. (Robertson Smith, *l.c.*, p. 98 ff.).

[3] Lev. xi. 21 ff.

dislike and loathing. To repress such an instinctive feeling is wrong and unholy. Man should obey the voice of nature and abstain from loathsome food, which only barbarity or over-civilisation finds enjoyable.[1] To this category belong, in my opinion, the eight species of animals (mostly of the lizard class) which are mentioned as specially unclean.[2] To the same category belong serpents, worms, and such like creatures. Then there are animals which a particular popular custom has once excluded from use as food. Here of course it is impossible to discover any definite reasons. The camel, the chief food of many nomad peoples, was forbidden in Israel, perhaps for a reason similar to that which now prevents most civilised nations from eating horse-flesh. Israel was a pastoral people, and would probably at first eat no flesh except that of oxen, sheep, and goats. But although in individual cases the reasons for such national customs are arbitrary, a man must not disregard the restrictions put upon him by the customs of his nation.[3] Finally, there are animals which do not show the usual marks of their species, animals which appear—though of course only to the eye of a superficial observer—to be as it were mutilated, defective, half-formed. Or, to put it more exactly, there are animals which do not possess all the marks of the animals which are like them externally, and which popular custom has considered eatable from the earliest days. Thus there are water animals without scales and fins, ruminants without cloven hoofs, etc.[4] These are therefore held to be defective and unclean.

[1] שקץ, תועבה, Lev. xi. 20, 23, 41, 42.

[2] Lev. xi. 29 ff. That considerations as to their being used in enchantments were the deciding cause here, as Sommer thinks, appears to me very improbable.

[3] The reader may be reminded of 1 Cor. xi. 14–16, where the ceremonial commandment of Paul is supported alike by natural instinct and by the prevailing national custom.

[4] *E.g.* Lev. xi. 3 ff., 9 ff., 26 f.

CHAPTER V.

THE RELIGIOUS BLESSEDNESS OF THE ISRAELITE.

1. The main characteristic of a pious Israelite's frame of mind, when this religion was in its zenith, was not a feeling of fear and uncertainty, but a truly joyful consciousness of divine mercy and favour. In the earlier Psalms this generally takes the form of confidence in God's help and protection and in His continued favour, and has a thoroughly healthy religious tone.[1] A firm confidence in their security and success, that agreed well with a humble reverence for this holy God, must have been the chief religious trait of the saints of that period. This feeling runs through all the ancient stories of Israel's legendary history, which describe how the divine blessing follows his ancestors step by step, how God protects and guides them in a manner which ofttimes seems to us like partiality, and how they, as God's covenant friends, can by their intercession obtain His mercy, even for those who stand further off from Him.[2]

The prophets and poets subsequent to the eighth century, and still more those subsequent to the Exile, have depicted with the utmost clearness that inward religious happiness which is quite independent of outward success and prosperity. The more the outward glory of the people is shattered, the more do its spiritual possessions, its wisdom, its law, its public worship, become the true joy of every pious Israelite. In Israel the righteous man, as such, is also blessed. For his portion is God, the living God;[3] and this God is the best of all possessions. He is more than father and mother.[4] The very

[1] Ps. iii. 4, 7, iv. 8 f., vii. 11, xi. 7, xviii. 2 f., 15 ff.

[2] Gen. xii. 10 ff., xxvi. 6 ff., xx. 7, 11 ff., xxx. 30, xxxi. 3, 11, 35, xxxv. 5, xxxix. 3, 5, 6, 23; Ex. viii. 4, 5, 24 ff., ix. 28, x. 17 f.

[3] Lam. iii. 24; Ps. lxxiii. 25; cxix. 57.

[4] Ps. xxvii. 10.

thought of him is dearer than all the fulness of earthly joy.[1] He is the fountain of living water,[2] the light which streams upon the saint.[3] Like the light of the sun to the inhabitants of earth,[4] the light of God's countenance shining graciously upon him is, to the saint, the highest ideal of joy. There is an endless variety of phrase for the thought that the pious exult in God, delight in Him, rejoice before him, as at a gladsome thanksgiving feast, and abide in His tabernacle.[5] In a word, they enjoy, in living communion with God, the highest and truest happiness man can enjoy—a happiness greater and more needful far than any that earth can give. This is most beautifully expressed in Ps. xvi. and xvii. The true Israel does not forget that "man doth not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God."[6] The motto for a wise life is "Blessed is the man who walketh in the ways of God."[7] Only in keeping the statutes of God is there a true life of sound wisdom.[8]

Thus to a genuine child of Israel the law is neither a heavy burden nor a hated yoke. It is the most precious, the most prized gift of God's grace. To fear God and to love Him with the whole heart and soul are feelings indissolubly connected, especially in Deuteronomy.[9] God gives Israel the law for an inheritance, and in it the saint has a treasure more to be desired than gold,[10] and sweeter than honey;[11] it is the centre of his thought, on which he meditates day and night;[12] the delight of his soul, towards which his love goes forth with a constant

[1] Ps. lxiii. 4, 6, lxxiii. 26.
[2] Jer. ii. 13, xvii. 13; Ps. xlvi. 5, xxxvi. 10.
[3] Prov. iv. 18 ff., vi. 23. [4] Ps. v. 12 f., xxxvi. 10 (xvii. 15).
[5] Isa. xxix. 19; Zech. x. 7; B. J. xxiv. 14, xxvi. 1, xli. 16; Ps. v. 12, xxviii. 7, xxxiii. 1, 21, xxxvi. 9, xl. 17, xliii. 4, lxxxv. 7 lxxxix. 16 ff., xcvii. 12, civ. 34, cv. 3; cf. lxi. 5, xvi. 11.
[6] Deut. viii. 3.
[7] Ps. i. 1, lxxxv. 10–14; Prov. x. 22; Isa. iii. 10; B. J. xlviii. 18 f.; Deut. xi. 26.
[8] תּוּשִׁיָּה, Prov. ii. 7, iii. 21, viii. 14; Job vi. 13.
[9] Deut. x. 12, xi. 1, 13, xiii. 4, xix. 9, xxx. 6.
[10] Deut. x. 13. [11] Ps. xix. 8 ff., cxix. 105.
[12] Ps. i. 3; Josh. i. 7, xxiii. 6.

yearning.[1] The wonderfully beautiful temple worship[2] is for a staunch Israelite the perfection of earthly bliss. Beside the altars of the great God he finds his true home.[3] A day in God's courts is better than a thousand anywhere else.[4] And though himself far away in a strange land, his longing soul transports the pious minstrel in thought to those joyous pilgrim bands in the midst of which he would so gladly be.[5] In God's house he feels himself God's guest, thrilled and blessed by the holy awe of the divine presence. God's revelations make a saint perfectly happy. If he has these, he asks for nothing else in heaven or in earth[6] He can be happy in the midst of suffering, though heart and flesh faint and fail.[7] Yea, even in distress, he can joyously exclaim, "When I sit in darkness, the Lord shall be a light unto me." The highest stage of this blessedness is "to see God," "to satisfy oneself with gazing on His likeness,"[8] an expression which certainly does not include a future blessedness, but denotes the highest fellowship with God,—almost, as it were, a fellowship of the senses,—and also the enjoyment of this gracious fellowship.[9] Hence, too, the saint knows no higher prayer than that God may enlighten his path,[10] may give glory unto His name,[11] and make it excellent in all the earth. When conscious fellowship with God ceases, when the saint is absent from the places of revelation, his soul pants after them, as the hart panteth after the water brooks; his moisture is turned into the drought of summer.[12] Thus God

[1] Ps. cxix. 14, 16, 20, 47, 54, 70, 77, 92, 97, 113, 127, 140, 143, 159, 167, 174.
[2] Ps. xxvi. 8, xxvii. 4.
[3] Ps. lxxxiv. 4.
[4] Ps. lxxxiv. 11.
[5] Ps. xlii. 5 (lxxxiv. 3 f., cxxxvii. 1, 5, 6). Certainly it is not to be overlooked that most of the singers of these Psalms probably belonged to the Levitical choirs that were closely connected with the temple worship.
[6] Ps. lxxiii. 25 f.
[7] Ps. lxxxiv. 7 (xxxiv. 20).
[8] Micah vii. 8; cf. Hab. iii. 18 (*καυχώμεθα ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσιν*, Rom. v. 3).
[9] Ps. xvii. 15 (Sept. must have read בהביט תמונתך), xvi. 11, etc. For the meaning cf. Isa. xxxviii. 11 (Ps. xxv. 14, סוד יהוה ליראיו; Prov. iii. 32).
[10] Ps. xxv. 4, 12.
[11] Ps. cxv. 1.
[12] Ps. xxxii. 4, xlii. 2 f., ii. 2 (Jonah ii. 5).

is the highest good, and communion with Him the one thing needful. This feeling echoes even more thrillingly from the second Jerusalem than from the first. It shows us a fresh religious life in the midst of a benumbing formalism, and points to the hidden springs of the religion of Jesus.

Moreover, communion with God gives a restful sense of security amid all the storms of human life. The godly may rest assured of His help and protection.[1] God is a Rock for those who trust in Him.[2] This security is emphasised as strongly as possible when it is said that in communion with God the godly have a sure pledge of life. Of course that does not mean that the godly are secure against the death of the body. Even when "eternal" life is spoken of,[3] the whole tone of the context, and the alternation with "length of days," show clearly that it is a mere rhetorical form of expression. Still less does it denote a future life secure from Sheol. For one always finds that such passages refer solely to security against some special danger to life. Hence the expressions "to deliver from the power of Sheol," "to deliver from death," must mean not deliverance from the power of death in another world, but rescue from the threatened danger of death here.[4] The thought primarily refers to this world, but it is at the same time of a mystical character, so that it has in itself the power of leading the thinker further. For, as soon as the expressions "communion with God" and "life" begin to be at all synonymous, the foundation is already laid of a true religious assurance of immortality, even although the doctrine itself is not yet consciously held.

In this sense it is said that the godly are written in the

[1] Ps. xxiii. 3 f., xxvii. 1 ff., lv. 23, lvi. 4, 12, cxxi. 5 f., xxxiv. 8 ff., xxii. 10 ff., l. 15; Prov. ii. 20 ff., iii. 6.

[2] Ps. xlii. 10, xliii. 2, xlvi. 2, 12, xlviii. 4, lxi. 4 f., lxii. 3, 7, lxvi. 9, lxxi. 3, 5, xci. 1 ff., 9, lxxxiv. 12.

[3] Ps. xxi. 7, xxii. 27, xxx. 4, xxxvii. 28, xli. 13; Neh. ii. 3; Bar. i. 11, Ps. lxxii. 7; cf. Ps. xci. 16, xxi. 5.

[4] Ps. xxxiii. 19, ciii. 4; Prov. x. 2, 16, 28; cf. Ps. xlix. 16, lxxiii. 23-26.

book of life,[1] that for them the fountains and paths of life are open.[2] God Himself is Israel's life;[3] His word sets before the people life or death.[4] He who chastises a child, rescues his soul from the realm of the dead. The godly man walks before God in the light of life.[5] Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of his saints.[6] He delivers the godly from death, from the jaws of hell.[7] Unto Him belong the issues from death.[8] Therefore he who desires life must draw near to God.[9] The righteous can look death in the face calmly and hopefully.[10] Thus the feeling of safety and blessedness in God rises to a complete triumph over the fear of death.

2. To communion with God is due the only philosophy which ever found expression among this people.[11] Israel's philosophy does not depend, like secular philosophy, on the metaphysical labours of the human intellect. The author of Ecclesiastes is, it is true, the first to waive aside as idle and useless man's subtle musings on the deepest problems of existence. But even Job and Proverbs give us the same purely religious conception of wisdom. The men who think themselves wise, the clever, the scornful, are really fools; and in His own time God shows that their cleverness is folly.[12] The wisdom of the heathen is foolishness, compared with the simplicity of the pious.[13] The "wise men" of the Old Testament are not persons "to whom the popular religion no longer

[1] Ps. lxix. 29; Dan. xii. 1.
[2] Ps. xvi. 9, xxxvi. 9 f.
[3] Deut. xxx. 20.
[4] Deut. iv. 1, 4, 33, 40, v. 16, 23, 33, vi. 2, 24, viii. 1 (xxx. 15, 19, xxxii. 47); Jer. xxi. 8 ff.; Prov. iii. 18, xxiii. 14.
[5] Ps. lvi. 13, cxix. 144, xci. 15.
[6] Ps. cxvi. 15.
[7] Ps. xvi. 10, xvii. 14 ff., xlix. 16, lxxiii. 23–26, xxvii. 13, xxiii. 6, xxx. 4, xxxvii. 28, ciii. 4, xxxiii. 19, etc.
[8] Ps. lxviii. 21.
[9] Ps. xxxiv. 13, xci. 15.
[10] Ps. xvii., xlix., lxxiii.; Prov. x. 2, xi. 4, 7, xii. 28, xiii. 14, xiv. 27, 32, xix. 23.
[11] Cf. Oehler, *Die Grundzüge der alttestamentlichen Weisheit*, 1854; Bruch, *Weisheitslehre der Hebräer*, 1851.
[12] Prov. iii. 34, xii. 15, xiv. 12, xvi. 25, xviii. 2; Ps. xiv. 1, liii. 2.
[13] Ezek. xxviii. 3 ff.

gave satisfaction" (Bruch). In Israel they do not form a separate class at all. Where they seem to do so,[1] they are either identified with the men of experience, the old, or else the term is simply applied to those who are godly, prudent, and upright. What gives Hebrew wisdom, as distinguished from prophecy, a resemblance to the philosophy of other nations, is, as Oehler rightly insists, its endeavour, in obedience to an inner necessity, to work up the ground thoughts of the Hebrew religion into a complete theory of life; to defend it against the difficulties and doubts which must necessarily arise from an empirical view of the world, and to apply it to the various problems of practical life. The wise in Israel relate the experience they have got from their own life and thought, on the basis of that view of life which God by His revelation has brought within His people's reach; an experience which was of course accessible only to those who had the inclination and the capacity, not merely to overcome by active practical work the difficulties involved in the problem of life, but also to ponder over them till they became intelligible. Consequently, the wise are in no sense prophets, but simply pious men in possession of a consistent theory of moral and religious life.

This wisdom of Israel—in which we must remember artistic skill[2] and purely practical sagacity[3] are still inseparably bound up with the higher moral wisdom—is based on the revelation of God, especially on that wonderful law[4] which distinguishes Israel above all other nations. God giveth wisdom.[5] The man to whom God speaks is wise. The commandment of God is not far off from Israel, so that it has first to be brought down from heaven, or from beyond the sea. It is nigh; it is

[1] Jer. xviii. 18; cf. Ezek. vii. 26; Prov. i. 6, xiii. 20; cf. xxiii. 24.

[2] Ex. xxxv. 25, xxxvi. 1, 2, 4.

[3] *E.g.* Prov. vi. 1 ff., 6 ff., 26, ix. 7 ff., xvii. 18 (i. 5 תחבלות), xvi. 12 ff., etc.; 2 Sam. xiii. 3, xiv. 2, xx. 16.

[4] Deut. iv. 6, 8; Josh. i. 8; Ps. xxxvii. 30 f.

[5] Prov, ii. 6, xx. 27; Jer. ix. 12; 1 Kings iii. 12.

in Israel's mouth—that he may do it.[1] Thus the revelation of God makes it possible for this people to understand the world in the light of God. Through the word of God the psalmist has more understanding than his teachers, than the wise.[2]

Hence, wisdom can be attained only along one line: by moral and religious experience of the truth that proceeds from God. He who seeks wisdom must be willing to receive instruction.[3] He must have humility towards God;[4] he must seek after God. Then he will understand all things, will find even wisdom.[5] The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom.[6] For this phrase is no doubt intended to describe the true fear of God as the august and holy Lord.[7] Now this is no longer the fear which, in the Hebrew nature-religion, makes a man unhappy, but that noble fear which includes love to God,[8] delight in His commandments,[9] and hatred of evil.[10] It is, in a word, "religion," which, being equally far removed from unbelief and from bold assurance [11] has the promise of life.[12] It is, at one and the same time, the result of true wisdom, and the only foundation on which such wisdom can be based.[13]

Accordingly, true wisdom is attainable only by one who has the moral and religious temperament. Whosoever willeth to do the will of God will learn also to understand His secrets and His statutes. In the world, and its phenomena,

[1] Deut. xxx. 11–14. [2] Ps. cxix. 99 f.

[3] Prov. i. 2, 5, iii. 11 f., xii. 1, xiii. 1, 24, xv. 5, xix. 20, iv. 1, 13, v. 12, xxiii. 23.

[4] Ps. xxv. 5, 8, li. 12 f., cxix. 9 f., 29, 33 ff., cxxxix. 23 ff.

[5] Prov. viii. 17, xxviii. 5.

[6] Prov. i. 7, ix. 10; Job xxviii. 28; Ps. cxi. 10 (Eccles. xii. 13), יראת־יהוה.

[7] Prov. xiii. 13, xiv. 16, xxviii. 14, מפחד תמיד; Ps. xxii. 24, 26, xxv. 12, xxxiii. 8, xc. 11.

[8] Ps. lx. 6; cf. 7. [9] Ps. cxii. 1. [10] Prov. viii. 13; Josh. xxiv. 14.

[11] Prov. x. 27, xiv. 26, xv. 16, xix. 23.

[12] Deut. iv. 10, v. 29, vi. 2, 13, 24, viii. 6; Hos. x. 3; Isa. xxxiii. 6; cf. xxix. 13; Micah vi. 9; Ps. xix. 10; Job xv. 4.

[13] Prov. ii. 5 (i. 29).

there will be revealed to such an one an eternal world of divine thoughts and purposes.[1] Assuredly no created being can sound the real depths of the wisdom of God. Heaven and earth cannot comprehend it. Destruction and death say, We have heard a rumour thereof. Wisdom herself created the world; consequently no created thing can comprehend her.[2] But true essential wisdom may be received by the godly man, so far as a creature is capable of receiving it. The pious Israelite has, in his inner world of thought, that which is as eternal and inviolable as God's own life; because, in reality, it is not essentially distinct from the divine life by which the world was made.[3] This is, in contrast with the vanity of the fool's thoughts, the true essence of life.[4] Hence, it is not surprising that this wisdom is reckoned of priceless value, more precious than the rarest jewels.[5] It guards against tempters.[6] It bestows security,[7] long life,[8] riches and power.[9] By true modesty [10] and noble self-restraint,[11] it gains favour in the sight of God and man.[12] All they that hate it, love death.[13]

[1] Ps. xcii. 6, civ., cxxxix. 17, cxlvii.; Job ix. 4 ff., xxvi. 2 ff., xxxviii. 4 ff.
[2] Job xxviii. 13, 22; Prov. viii. 22 ff., xxx. 3 f.
[3] Prov. viii. 22 ff.; Job xxviii. 27 f.; Jer. x. 12, li. 15 ff.
[4] תּוּשִׁיָּה, Prov. iii. 21, ii. 7, viii. 14; Job vi. 13.
[5] Job xxviii. 14 ff.; Prov. iii. 18, viii. 11, xiii. 14, xvi. 16, 22, xx. 15; cf. Eccles. vii. 12, 19, ix. 16.
[6] Prov. i. 10 ff., ii. 12 ff.
[7] Prov. i. 32, ii. 7 f., 12.
[8] Prov. iii. 2, 16, iv. 10, ix. 11.
[9] Prov. xxiv. 3 ff.
[10] Prov. xxv. 6 (Luke xiv. 8 ff.).
[11] Prov. xxv. 16.
[12] Prov. iii. 4, viii. 35.
[13] For יראת יהוה there is simply יראה, Job iv. 6, xv. 4, xxii. 4—for דעת אלהים simply דעת Hos. iv. 6. The individual utterances of wisdom are called חכמות, Prov. i. 20, ix. 1.

CHAPTER VI.

THE OLD TESTAMENT DOCTRINE OF ATONEMENT.

1. God's covenant with Israel does not presuppose sinlessness from the first. If it did, it would really be a cruel deception, mocking the frailty of men by holding up before them a phantom salvation. On the contrary, in spite of the sin which cleaves to every man, it claims to bring about a real salvation. But, at the same time, according to Israel's original view, every sin cannot be atoned for. The oldest stories everywhere take for granted that any flagrant act of wilful disobedience to God's express command, any defiling of His holy land, any violation of His property and His rights has, as its inevitable result, punishment by "ban." Such sins cannot be expiated by sacrifice, whether bloody or bloodless.[1] "If one man sin against another, then men may intercede with God for him, but if he sin against God (knowingly rebel against the statutes of the sanctuary), who shall intercede for him?"[2] In other cases, however, ancient Israel, like other nations of antiquity, believed that it could avert God's anger by sacrifices and feasts. That is proved by the polemic of the earlier prophets against such confidence, often purely outward, in the efficacy of sacrifice to blot out sin. We also meet with a naïve confidence that God can be reconciled by works of asceticism, provided His ban does not immediately sweep away the guilty, for example in stories such as 2 Sam. xii. 15 ff. and 1 Kings xxi. 27.

The later law, on the other hand, knows of a reconciliation with God through sacrifices, only in the case of a few comparatively trivial offences. The relationship is conceived of as being the same as that of one man committing a legal offence against another. Now in courts

[1] 1 Sam. iii. 14; Josh. vii., etc. [2] 1 Sam. ii. 25 (Sept. Thenius).

of law there are crimes for which compensation is absolutely out of the question, death being the inevitable punishment. Such are intentional murder, adultery, man-stealing, showing disrespect to parents, etc.[1] Others again may be redressed by compensation, if the person injured is good enough not to exact his rights to the uttermost. Examples of this are: accidental manslaughter, sexual licence in cases where there is no question of marriage rights, etc.[2] This comes out most clearly in connection with manslaughter. Only a person who has robbed another of life "inadvertently," without bearing him a grudge, can escape the avenger of blood by fleeing to a city of refuge. Such an asylum does not shelter a wilful murderer. For murder no ransom can be accepted; the land would thereby be defiled as conniving at the crime; nothing but the blood of the murderer can cleanse it.[3] According to the Law, this is precisely the relation between the sinner and God. In the case of one who, by his sin, intentionally disowns the covenant itself, there can be no question of sacrifice. He has himself cut away the ground on which it would have been possible for him to obtain reconciliation. For one who sins "with a high hand," that is, with the intention of acting in defiance of God's commandment, there is no sin-offering. He refuses, in fact, to enter the circle within which such a sacrifice has efficacy.[4] Hence that soul must be cut off from among the people, whether God do it Himself by an act of judgment, or commission the authorities to do it.[5]

[1] Ex. xxi. 12–17; Lev. xx. 10, xxiv. 17; Num. xxxv. 16 ff., 30 ff.; Deut. xxii. 24.

[2] Ex. xxi. 13 f., xxii. 15 f.; Lev. xix. 20; Num. xxxv. 23 f.

[3] Num. xxxv. 11, 15 ff., 19 f., 30 f.

[4] ביד רמה, Num. xv. 30, xxxiii. 3; Ex. xiv. 8; cf. דבר יהוה בזה, Num. xv. 31.

[5] Ex. xxii. 18 f., xxx. 33, xxxi. 14; Lev. vii. 20, 27, x. 2, xvii. 4, 10, xviii. 22 f., 29, xx. 6, 11 ff., 15 ff., 27, xxiv. 16; Num. iv. 20, xv. 32 f., etc.; cf. Lev. xviii. 29, xix. 8, xx. 18, xxii. 3; Num. xv. 30; cf. Ex. xxii. 18, xxi. 15–17; cf. Lev. xx. 5 f., xxiii. 30.

But where there has been no evil intention to resist God, but only an involuntary transgression of some divine arrangement,[1]—as, for example, where voluntary self-accusation,[2] without the person concerned having been convicted, plainly shows that he was willing to obey, and sinned only "through inadvertence"[3]—then we have a case where, with the consent of the injured party, compensation may suffice without the full strength of the law being brought into play. Now in the case of God this goodwill always exists. The individual member of the community in covenant with Him, He treats with love and mercy, just as His righteousness towards the frail race must, in itself, mean tenderness and consideration. He is willing to be considerate to their failings; He is the merciful and the forgiving One.[4]

2. Thus, for a special class of offences, the Law presupposes the possibility of a sinner being allowed to clear himself of opposition to God, and remain within the covenant of grace. But it is not from these arrangements that we can learn what the true religion of the Old Testament believed regarding the reconciliation of the sinner with God. For the sins for which the sin-offering of the law has efficacy, have no great importance either for the life of the people or for the inner consciousness of the individual. To understand the real Old Testament doctrine of atonement we have to look away from the sacrifices and study the thoughts of the great prophets and psalmists. In their view, there is no limit to God's willingness to be reconciled. If Israel draws near to Him in penitence, he may be sure that he will be welcomed with open arms. Right in the heart of

[1] נעלם כימנו, לא ידע, Lev. v. 2, 3, 17. [2] So Lev. v. 4 f., 21 f.
[3] בשגגה, Lev. iv. 22, 27, v. 15, xxii. 14; Num. xv. 24 f., 27 f.
[4] נשא עון, נשא ל, סלח ל, Exod. xxxii. 32, xxxiv. 6, 7; Num. xiv. 18 f. The civil aspect of such a transgression does not, of course, come into consideration here.

the sternest utterances of judgment and wrath, there is always something about a willingness to forgive, at least in the future.[1] Where human mercy could not and dared not re-tie the broken bond, divine mercy is still ready to do so.[2] This omnipotence of God's redeeming grace depends, on the one hand, on God's own nature. He is the gracious One who, even in wrath, remembers mercy, who takes away sin and passes by transgression.[3] He swears by Himself that He desires, not the death, but the conversion of the sinner.[4] He does not deal with frail men after their sins, but He forgives their iniquity.[5] Hence, it is an essential attribute of the divine personality that its love should be stronger than human sin, that it should overcome even the resistance of sin. Even where God must break the existing covenant on account of Israel's sins, He remains willing to enter into a covenant out of which a new form of salvation may spring. On this conviction is based the hope which the prophets have of a new dispensation of grace after judgment.

But it is not merely this general goodness of God with which Israel is concerned. God loves Israel with a peculiar covenant love for which earth cannot furnish a metaphor of sufficient strength.[6] And this love of His outlasts Israel's sin. His heart yearns to forgive.[7] He will let Himself be found even by sinners.[8] He will cast their sins into the depths of the sea.[9] Hence, as regards Israel, God's forgiving mercy is more exactly defined as

[1] Deut. xxx. 1 ff.; Jer. xviii. 8, xxvi. 19 f.; Ezek. xxxiii. 8–19; Hos. vi. 3, 11, vii. 1, xi. 8, xiv. 5 ff.; Joel ii. 18 ff., etc.

[2] B. J. liv. 6 (already a near approach to the parable of the Prodigal Son. The idea is different in Jer. iii. 1).

[3] Cf. among other passages, Jonah iv. 10; Ps. lxxvii. 10, lxxxvi. 5, lxxviii. 38; Micah vii. 18; cf. Ps. cxxx. 4, xcix. 8.

[4] Ezek. xviii. 23, 32, xxxiii. 11; cf. Jer. iv. 1 f., iii. 12, 22, vii. 3, xviii. 8.

[5] Ps. ciii. 9–13; B. J. lvii. 16.

[6] Jer. li. 5; B. J. l. 1, xlix. 15 f. (Jer. xvii. 14; Hos. xiv. 9; Ps. li. 3).

[7] Hos. xi. 8 f., xiii. 14, xiv. 4. [8] B. J. lv. 6 lxv. 1 f.

[9] Micah vii. 19 (Isa. xxxviii. 17).

covenant mercy. Because of the blood of His covenant He bestows redemption; He opens a fountain for sin and for uncleanness.[1] For His own sake, for His own name's sake, that is, because His own honour, the end of His salvation, is bound up with the development of this people, He will not let them be lost, but is ever ready to take them back again.[2] In the love which God bears to the ideal Israel, His beloved son, the Israel of history has the constant assurance that reconciliation is possible. And whatever represents to Him this ideal Israel, becomes the channel of His mercy. Such is His holy city, such His sanctuary,[3] such are the patriarchs, such too are David and Moses His beloved,[4] and such the Servant of Jehovah who, as a guilt-offering, gives His life for Israel.[5]

Thus God does not forsake His people. Individual generations may reach such a stage of apostasy that judgment cannot be averted,[6] but not the whole people. God will wash away the filth and blood of Zion with the spirit of judgment and of destruction, that it may again be called the city of righteousness, the faithful city.[7] He does not punish Israel, as He punishes the enemies of His people, with an everlasting punishment.[8] He gives to its deliverer,

[1] Zech. ix. 11 (in the New Testament, "on account of the blood of Christ shed to establish the new covenant." "This cup is the new covenant in My blood.") Lev. xxvi. 42; cf. Zech. xiii. 1.

[2] B. J. xliii. 25, xlviii. 9, lii. 5; Joel ii. 17, 19; Ezek. xx. 9, 14, 22, 44, xxxvi. 16 ff., 22, 23, xxxix. 7, 25; Jer. xiv. 21; Deut. ix. 28, xxxii. 27; Ps. lxxix. 9, cxv. 1, 2.

[3] B. J. lxii. 1; cf. 1 Kings viii. 29 ff.

[4] 1 Kings xi. 13, 32, xiv. 21, xv. 4; 2 Kings viii. 19, xix. 34; Deut. ix. 27. (We should remember in this connection the intercession of God's friends, whether angels or men, Job xxii. 30, xxxiii. 23, xlii. 8–10; cf. also Ezek. xxii. 30 f.; Jer. v. 1).

[5] B. J. liii. 10, 12, lxv. 8.

[6] 2 Kings xxiii. 26, xxiv. 3, 20; Isa. vi.; Jer. xv. 1 ff., "even though Moses and Samuel were to intercede for this people, that would no longer help them."

[7] Isa. i. 26 f., iv. 4, xxxiii. 5 f., 24; Zech. xiii. 1; Jer. xxix. 11.

[8] B. J. xxvii. 7; cf. Jer. xxx. 11, 18, xlvi. 28; Amos ix. 7 ff.; Hos. xi. 8 ff.

as ransom for His people, the most distant heathen lands.[1] He remembereth His covenant and showeth pity.[2] And Satan, who would still gladly accuse "the brand plucked out of the fire," he sternly repulses.[3] But in the exclusive emphasising of the *people*, we do not find that this doctrine is logically carried out to the Christian conclusion that there is no limit to the possibility of the conversion of *an individual*, so long as he is not hardened in sin. At the most, there is only a hint of it in passages like Ezekiel, chapters xviii. and xxxiii.

3. For the individual Israelite therefore, and for the sinful community, reconciliation depends objectively on a connection being maintained with the true Israel which is loved by God, and subjectively on the sin being negatived as one not committed consciously or of set purpose, and being repented of and made of none effect by a ransom. These two conditions together complete the actual process of reconciliation.

This true Israel, in connection with which the sinner can find reconciliation, receives special embodiment in specially ideal and prominent members of the people on whom God's love is firmly fixed. Thus the thought of the fathers whom God loved brings pardon to their descendants.[4] Thus Moses by his personal intercession, is able to gain God's favour for the people he will not sever himself from or forsake.[5] He gains it by reminding God of His purposes of salvation for this people, and that His own honour is at stake.[6] Later on, God is gracious, for David's sake, to his successors.[7] The real holiness of God's people is, for the Law, embodied in its sacred forms. The consecration of the people to God receives official expression in the priesthood, just as that, in

[1] B. J. xliii. 3, 4, 14.
[2] Ps. cvi. 45 f.; Amos v. 4.
[3] Zech. iii. 2.
[4] Ex. xxxii. 13, xxxiii. 1.
[5] Ex. xxxii. 20, 31.
[6] Num. xiv. 12 ff.; Josh. vii. 7 ff.
[7] 2 Kings viii. 19.

turn, culminates in the high priesthood. The priest can "give covering" to the sinner, so that he may draw near to God with his prayer for pardon (כִּפֶּר עַל). The presence of God among this people, and His willingness to let Himself be found, receive permanent expression in the holy place. Hence these forms are the objective acts with which atonement is associated. In the eyes of the ancient people, too, they undoubtedly had this value, although the loftiest conception of the doctrine of atonement in the great prophets, and in such Psalms as xxxii. and li., neither requires them nor attaches any importance to them.

4. From the subjective standpoint a person must, as it were, revoke his sin by declaring that it was not committed by him of set purpose. Nothing, therefore, could be more natural than the idea of effecting this atonement by the bringing of a gift pure and simple—that is, by obtaining the favour of God by means of a material present acceptable to Him, or by a humility flattering to the pride of the injured party. Such was the mould in which the ideas of ancient Israel were cast, as we see clearly from ancient proverbs and stories. The sinner brought God a gift to appease Him. He bowed before Him in fasting, in an attitude of mourning and humiliation, and sought, in this way, to make his prayer for pardon impressive and effectual.[1]

But we meet with a far higher conception when the prophets and the psalmists of the prophetic period tell us how the guilty people can obtain reconciliation with its God, or when the process of reconciliation is presented to us, in the writings of the prophetic period, *without any reference to those outward forms.* The people can never, as the prophets are well aware, deserve reconciliation by its own

[1] Cf. 1 Sam. xxvi. 19; 2 Sam. xii. 16–22, xvi. 10; 1 Kings xxi. 27, etc. The money for repentance and atonement belonged to the priests (2 Kings xii. 17).

merits. It could never wash itself clean from its sin.[1] In fact it did not even make an effort to obtain reconciliation.[2] Nothing but the free grace, which depends on God's purposes of love, brings salvation. For the gifts which have been presented to Him from of old, the sacred rites of sacrifice and self-mortification have, in themselves, no power to atone for a nation of sinners. To seek God with sheep and oxen, to torment themselves, in His honour, at feasts and new moons, with prayers, fastings, and rending of clothes—all this the Israelites were always ready to do whenever the blows of God fell heavily upon them[3]; ready, if need be, to offer up their own sons. Such sacrifices were continually before God.[4] But for such conduct prophecy has nothing but distinct condemnation, and thus it opens up the way for a specially important development of this doctrine.

Naturally the sacred forms of atonement, as such, were neither attacked nor questioned by the prophets, but certainly their significance in relation to God was.[5] To that most important question, whether the covenant with all its promises, even when broken externally, could be again renewed through God's covenant mercy, these forms have no answer to give. In fact, when great attention is given to them, they may even have an injurious effect on the people in regard to religion. For they regard sacrifice as an act; and it is only natural for human ignorance and pride to imagine that God is reconciled by the mere act itself—that sacrifice is not a means of grace bestowed upon the people by God, but a gift, valuable in itself, to the receiver. The superstitious mass of the members of the old covenant might

[1] Jer. ii. 22. [2] B. J. xliii. 23 ff.; Ezek. xxxvi. 22, 32.
[3] Micah vi. 6, 7. [4] Ps. l. 8 ff.
[5] Cf. Jer. xvii. 21; B. J. lvi. 2, lviii. 12 f.; Joel ii. 15 ff.; Hagg. i. 7 ff.; Job xlii. 8 (Mal. i. 7 f., 12 f.). Even in Ps. li. 18; according to the following verses, which certainly belong to the original Psalm, sacrifice is only regarded as not being desired by God until he should have again built up the walls of Zion which, during the Exile, are lying in ruins.

well take this view—at any rate, without showing such a want of understanding as the mass of the members of the new covenant who consider that the condition of reconciliation is the sacrament as an *opus operatum*, or pious works, or the covenant death of Jesus, as such, without any inward appropriation of it, or orthodox belief as an affair of the intellect. But such a view necessarily destroyed in the people the one condition of reconciliation—a humble and believing spirit.

Hence, in opposition to this pernicious idea, it is said that God has absolutely no need of these sacrifices; that He now demands them as little as He formerly did at Sinai. "For aught I care," says God by Jeremiah,[1] "ye may eat your burnt-offerings with your sacrifices." God will have no sacrifices of any kind. They are an abomination to Him. He regards sacrificial assemblies as a mere treading of His courts.[2] Fasting and prayer avail nothing.[3] The wicked man, who hates instruction, should not take God's name into his mouth.[4] When the people, as if they had not forsaken righteousness and order, betake themselves to fasting, and yet never leave off practising covetousness and injustice, they deceive themselves utterly. Sacrifice, in a wicked spirit, has no value.[5] Hence when the wicked among exilic Israel desire, in defiance of God's commandment, to have a temple and a regular service in a foreign land, it has to be regarded as an abomination and a crime.[6]

This grand view of reconciliation, which put sacrifice and the whole apparatus of human ritual into the background as non-essential, is clearly seen in the general attitude which most of the prophets take up toward the forms of worship. Ezekiel, it is true, is once more heartily in love with them;

[1] Ps. l. 10–13, xl. 7; Hos. v. 6, vi. 6; Jer. vi. 20, vii. 4, 21 f.; Amos v. 25; Isa. i. 11 ff.; Micah vi. 6 f.

[2] Isa. i. 12 ff.; Lev. xxvi. 31.

[3] Isa. i. 15; Jer. xiv. 12; Zech. vii. 5.

[4] Ps. l. 16 f.

[5] Prov. xv. 8, xxi. 3, 27; B. J. lviii. 2 ff.

[6] B. J. lxvi. 1–3.

before his eye there stands a new temple in new symbolic forms.[1] But even Jeremiah still warns against superstitious inquiries regarding the outward belongings of the sanctuary, the ark of the covenant, and the like.[2] Sacrifices are transfigured by the prophets into spiritual thank-offerings.[3] The congregation of the future will be filled with the Spirit, and have direct relations with the covenant God of Israel.[4]

Now, just as the outward forms of sacrifice begin to fade away into shadows, the age is lighted up with the pregnant thought of a nobler sacrifice about to come. The Servant of God who represents Israel's calling, and who, uniting the sinful people with its God, becomes Himself an atonement for Israel, suffers and dies in His vocation in order to secure this reconciliation. His death, freely endured for the people, is a means of reconciliation of a new kind, an offering for sin unlike the victims slain of old.[5] Thus, as the shadows disappear, prophecy grasps the substance.

5. This conception of the problem of reconciliation is the ruling idea in the prophetic writings, and has found incomparable expression in Ps. xxxii. and li. On God's covenant love, and on the connection of His honour and His plan of salvation with this people, depends the indestructible possibility of reconciliation. Nothing is required save the inclination of the heart which alone enables this possibility of reconciliation to be grasped, and which displays itself in true, infallible signs. According to the abundant testimonies which we have from Amos to Zechariah, the actual process of reconciliation is as follows:—

The first requisite is earnest and unfeigned sorrow for sin, whether combined with outward tokens of penitence or not.[6] At the preacher's call to repent, the Israelite must confess

[1] Ezek. xl. ff. [2] Jer. iii. 16 f., vii. 4, xxxi. 33.
[3] Ps. l. 14, 23, li. 19, lxix. 31 ff. [4] Jer. xxxi. 33; Joel iii. 1 ff.
[5] אָשָׁם, B. J. liii. 10.
[6] Deut. iv. 29 f.; Jer. iii. 21; Joel ii. 12-17.

that his punishment was just;[1] must, with penitential tears, acknowledge the chastisement of God and take words with him, the calves of the lips, instead of outward offerings.[2] He must yearn to be freed, not merely from punishment, which makes him unhappy, but from sin itself, which keeps him at variance with God's holy will.[3] A broken and a contrite heart that loathes its sin finds reconciliation.[4] For "when I would have kept silence, my bones waxed old through my roaring all the day long."[5]

But when this sorrow is genuine, and no mere "feigned conversion,"[6] the whole tenor of the life must give proof of the change. True repentance shows itself in sterling uprightness, generosity, and mercy, and in the forsaking of idolatry.[7] "Break up your fallow ground," cries Jeremiah to his contemporaries.[8] "Make you a new heart and a new spirit"[9] is Ezekiel's advice. And many of the most beautiful passages in the Prophets insist that deeds, not words, prove a conversion true.[10]

God alone can replace the old antagonism to Himself by this new disposition. He Himself effects conversion by changing the stony heart into a heart of flesh. He teaches men to bethink themselves of their latter end. His prophets have,

[1] Ps. xxv. 7, xxxviii. 19, xli. 5, li. 1 ff., lxv. 4, cxxx. 1 ff.; Jer. iii. 13, xiv. 20; Lam. iii. 39 ff.; Lev. xxvi. 40; 1 Kings viii. 47; 2 Kings xxii. 19; Prov. xxviii. 13; Job xlii. 6.

[2] Hos. v. 15, xiv. 3; Jer. xxx. 14 f., xxxi. 9, 18 f., l. 4 ff., 19; Micah vii. 9; Ps. li. 5 f. (God desires integrity, Ps. li. 8).

[3] Hos. vii. 15 f.; cf. Micah iii. 9.

[4] Ezek. xviii. 30 ff., xx. 43; Ps. li. 19; B. J. lvii. 15.

[5] Ps. xxxii. 3 ff. This is also very beautifully described in Micah vii. 7 ff.

[6] שׁוּב בִּשֶׁקֶר, Jer. iii. 10; "fleeting goodness," Hos. vi. 4 (it must be done "with the whole heart," Jer. xxiv. 7).

[7] Hos. xiv. 9; B. J. xxvii. 9 (Prov. x. 12, xvi. 6, xvii. 9, xxi. 13); Isa. i. 16 ff.; Jer. iv. 4, 14, vii. 3, xxii. 3; Ezek. xviii. 27 ff.; Amos v. 15 ff., 23–25, etc.

[8] Jer. iv. 3, 14; Hos. x. 12.

[9] Ezek. xviii. 31, xxxiii. 11.

[10] Hos. vi. 6, xii. 7, xiv. 2; Isa. i. 18; B. J. lvi. 1 ff., lviii. 8–14. Even the emphasising of the Sabbath, and of the building of the temple, B. J. lvi. 4, lviii. 13; Jer. xvii. 21 ff.; Hagg. i. 8, 10 ff., 13 ff., is only an individual instance of the demand that goodness of disposition should manifest itself in faithful and active work.

in fact, no higher office than to create this frame of mind.[1] But there must be combined with it a firm and joyful belief that God both can and will forgive and succour.[2] The poor, the sad, the needy, who give God the glory and seek Him in prayer, obtain a hearing.[3] This, then, is the process of reconciliation. The divine word or act of punishment strikes home, produces sorrow for, and a strong recoil from, sin; and arouses a confident hope that God will, in His covenant mercy, welcome the prodigal.[4] This whole procedure, on man's part, is generally spoken of as a return to God,[5] a seeking after Him,[6] or an endeavour to appease Him."[7] And as soon as that occurs, God thinks no more of former sin.[8]

Whoever is reconciled feels he has a clean heart, a heart no longer stained with the guilt of sin, a new spirit of assurance which makes him no longer uncertain as to his position before God.[9] This feeling finds vent in joyful thanksgiving to God,[10] in gladsome worship of Him,[11] and in eager zeal to show to other sinners also the way of salvation,[12] but of course above all in strictly moral conduct.[13] To this sense of the blessedness of reconciliation which, in accordance with the whole conception of the Old Testament, is often coincident with the conscious-

[1] Hagg. i. 14; cf. 12; Ezek. xi. 19, xxxvi. 26 f.; Deut. xxx. 6; Ps. xc. 12; Jer. xvii. 14, xxxi. 19, cf. vi. 8; Hos. xiv. 2 ff.

[2] Hos. vi. 1, xii. 7; B. J. lxiii. 16; cf. Isa. x. 20, xii. 2, xvii. 7; B. J. xiv. 32, xxv. 1; Jer. xvii. 5 ff., etc.

[3] Jer. xiii. 16, xxix. 12 ff.; B. J. lv. 1, lxi. 1 ff., lxiv. 4, lxvi. 2.

[4] *E.g.* Jonah iii. 5–10 (Job viii. 5, xi. 13 ff., xxii. 21 ff., the counsel of his friends).

[5] שׁוּב אל־יהוה, *e.g.* Isa. i. 27, vi. 10; Jer. iii. 7, 14, iv. 1, v. 3, xviii. 8, 11, xxiv. 7, xxv. 5, xxvi. 3; Deut. iv. 30, xxx. 1; Ezek. xiii. 22, xviii. 21, 23, 32; Hos. xiv. 2, cf. also 5 (cf. שׁבי־פשׁע B. J. lix. 20).

[6] דרשׁ את־יהוה, *e.g.* Jer. l. 4 ff.; B. J. lv. 6, lviii. 2, etc. שׁהר אל, פחד אל, בקשׁ, בקשׁ, *e.g.* Hos. iii. 5; Jer. xxix. 13; Deut. iv. 29; Zeph. ii. 3; Ps. lxxviii. 34.

[7] חלה Mal. i. 9. [8] Ezek. xxxiii. 15 f. [9] Ps. li. 12 (xc. 14).

[10] Ps. li. 14, xc. 14, liv. 8 (lvii. 9 ff., lxix. 31 ff., cxix. 108; Isa. xxxviii. 9 ff.

[11] As without any such reference, Deut. xii. 12, 18 ff., xvi. 11, 14, xxvi. 12 ff., xxvii. 7.

[12] Ps. li. 15, xxxii. 8.

[13] נקיון, Hos. viii. 5. That follows, as a matter of course, from "the new heart of circumcision," which is a condition of reconciliation (Jer. iv. 4, xxxii. 39 ff.; Ezek. xviii. 31.)

ness of deliverance from sore trouble, we owe no inconsiderable number of the most beautiful Psalms.

How great was the value attached by the prophetic age to this consciousness of reconciliation is shown by the rich variety of expressions for God's act of forgiveness. God takes away guilt,[1] blots it out,[2] washes it away,[3] covers it up,[4] veils,[5] expiates,[6] cleanses,[7] heals it.[8] He does not remember sin,[9] he removes it,[10] passes it by,[11] casts it behind his back,[12] forgives it,[13] lets it be made good.[14] All these expressions take for granted that, in His exercise of omnipotent mercy, God has the full right to forgive sin, absolutely without regard to legal compensation and satisfaction, as soon as there is no antagonism of will between Himself and man; as soon as man actually ceases his opposition to God, God remembers no more his former sins.[15]

6. The Law, in so far as it deals with the question of atonement, naturally regards the sacred ritual as capable of effecting reconciliation. In the two guilt-offerings the thought of a gift as a renunciation of property is firmly maintained. The person has to show his penitence, his readiness to make good the error he has committed, not merely in words but also in deeds. Now, on the one hand, this meets the case only of a limited class of sins. On the

[1] נשׂא עון, Hos. xiv. 3; Isa. xxxiii. 24; Ps. lxxxv. 3.
[2] מחה, Jer. xviii. 23; B. J. xliii. 25, xliv. 22; Ps. li. 3, 11.
[3] רחץ, Isa. iv. 4; כבס, Ps. li. 3, 9.
[4] כפה, Ps. lxxxv. 3, xxii. 1.
[5] כפר (with ל of the person), Deut. xxi. 8; Ps. lxv. 4; Isa. vi. 7, xxii. 14; B. J. xxvii. 9; Jer. xviii. 23; Ezek. xvi. 63.
[6] חטא, Ps. li. 9. [7] טהר, Ps. li. 4; Jer. xxxiii. 8.
[8] רפא, Jer. iii. 22.
[9] לא זכר Jer. xxxi. 34; Ezek. xviii. 22, 28, 30, xxxiii. 16; B. J. xliii. 25; Ps. li. 11.
[10] הסיר, Isa. vi. 7; B. J. xxvii. 9.
[11] העביר, Job vii. 21; Zech. iii. 4. [12] Isa. xxxviii. 17.
[13] סלח ל, Jer, v. 1, xxxi. 34, xxxiii. 8, l. 20; 1 Kings viii. 50.
[14] נרצה, . J. xl. 2.
[15] Ezek. xviii. 26 ff., xxxiii. 15 ff.; Isa. i. 17, 18.

other hand, the opposition to a superstitious over-estimate of human acts of penitence is also at work. It is not the act, the gift, which produces the result. No demand is anywhere made for special activity in self-mortification and fasting. The intrinsic value of the gifts may be small, may even sink into absolute insignificance, provided the symbolical act of surrender remain as a token of penitence. It is God Himself who gives for this purpose the blood, the life of the animal, which belongs exclusively to Himself. And it is of God's mere good pleasure that this becomes a means of reconciliation; though certainly from its highly sacred associations blood is, as a symbol of reconciliation, peculiarly appropriate. The one really essential point in the whole ceremony of sacrifice is the confession of sin, whether that is done through an act or expressly in a solemn form of words.[1] The person renounces his sin, confesses himself guilty in the sight of God, and does what God requires in order to make good whatever offences he has committed.

B. THE RELIGIOUS VIEW OF THE WORLD.

(*a*) *God and the World.*

CHAPTER VII.

THE SPIRITUAL PERSONAL GOD OF ISRAEL.

1. The Old Testament nowhere felt the need of proving the existence of God. In the time of Mosaism, such an attempt would have been simply unintelligible. At that time, even among the heathen, there was everywhere a per-

[1] Lev. xvi. 21; Num. v. 7 (2 Sam. xii. 13).

fectly unhesitating conviction as to the existence of the Deity. All the religious errors of the time were due to a confounding of this Deity with the world of sense, with the life and sorrows of external nature. Least of all, however, could the religion of Israel, which claimed to be a revelation of the living God, begin to discuss the existence of that God. Its own existence was, in fact, a proof of it. Without that it would be itself an empty deceit, having neither right nor title to exist. Hence it could no more wish to prove the existence of God than an ordinary man feels the need of proving that he himself exists. Accordingly, it is not a proof of God's existence, but rather an indication of how to obtain an inward conviction of His majesty and omnipotence, when early psalms point out how the vault of heaven testifies to the glory of its Creator; how day keeps preaching unto day, and night unto night, a sermon that sends its echoes out through all the earth;[1] how the awful peal of the thunder proclaims to every creature the majesty of the God whose voice it is;[2] how the world itself and, above all, man's position of favour and unmerited honour bear witness to that Creator.[3] One might speak of these as indications of the teleological argument for the existence of God, which is always the first to occur to a simple faith. It is, however, nearer the truth to say that belief in God is made heartier and warmer by a contemplation of the beauty and glory of nature. It was rather the later ages that felt the need of having their belief in the existence of God strengthened, partly because people were then beginning to think and reason more about religion, but mainly because when face to face with heathen gods, in times of national misfortune, the Israelites might easily have lost the firm conviction that their God was really the living and true God. This, then, is the task which specially belongs to the prophets and poets in the days of Israel's sore distress, when the scoffer exclaims, "Where now is thy God?"

[1] Ps. xix. 1 ff. [2] Ps. xxix. [3] Ps. viii.

In this sense the author of Job points out how the power and wisdom of the Creator are revealed in the glories of nature;[1] and other poets and prophets reiterate in splendid fashion this "teleological" proof of the revelation of God in His world.[2] Above all, the prophet of the Exile reminds his unhappy people that their religion points them to "the foundations of the earth," and that they ought, therefore, to know how convincingly creation testifies of God.[3]

But all this is not really meant by these men as a proof of God's existence. Even in the most despairing passages of Job there is nowhere even a moment of uncertainty about the being of God. Indeed, even the scepticism of the Levitical period does not touch this ground. For "the preacher" Solomon everything rocks and sways; but "the fear of God" always remains for him the most certain of all things. Right well the Old Testament knows, and that in Psalms which are certainly not among the latest,[4] of persons who say "There is no God." But that does not mean theoretical atheists, for whom the existence of God might and should be formally proved. These "fools" say in their heart, "There is no God," that is, all their plans and calculations take this for granted. In all their thoughts and acts they leave God wholly out of account as One who is not present and need not be considered. They are not essentially different from those who "forget God," but who, nevertheless, have God's name constantly on their lips.[5] They are, therefore, *practical* atheists, with whom there can be no argument, because they do not theoretically dispute the existence of God but simply do not allow the fact to have any real influence over their lives. In fact, they would not understand a proof even if they got it. For though they may be clever enough after the human standard, they are quite inaccessible to *true wisdom*, to the moral and

[1] Job xii. 9, xxxvii.–xl.
[2] Jer. xiv. 22; Ps. civ. (xciv. 9, 10).
[3] B. J. xl. 21; cf. 28 ff., xlii. 5, xlv. 18.
[4] Ps. x. 4, 11, xiv. 1 (liii. 2).
[5] Ps. l. 22; cf. 16.

religious meaning of life. They lack the faculty by which to apprehend the reality of the eternal world, of which the "natural" man, the fool in the Biblical sense of the word, has no conception.

2. In the Old Testament conception of God, nothing stood out from the first so strongly and unmistakably as the *personality* of the God of Israel. There is nowhere even the faintest inclination to the thought of a God without consciousness or will. It is the same in the Exile when, according to A, the command or word of God—that is, the expression of His free, self-conscious will—establishes the foundations of the world, as among the earlier writers who speak of God as legend does. The picture is always that of a God who sees that the world of His creation is good, as well as that mankind have subsequently wandered from the right way, who, therefore, stands contrasted with the world as *self-conscious reason*[1]—of a God who talks with the saints, who gives commandments which are to regulate Israel's life, who gives instructions in accordance with which the great leader leads His people to Palestine, etc.,[2]—of a God therefore who reveals Himself as *free will*, and that, too, as wise and moral will. In the covenant, this God acts as a Person with other persons.[3] And when He swears by Himself,[4] He represents Himself, in this free act of self-consciousness, as objective. In short, the God of the old covenant is thoroughly self-conscious, independent of the world, free, personal. He is regarded as the independent Lord of the world, perfectly free from entanglement in the life of nature. Thus the writer C[5] takes the very name of the covenant God, Jehovah, to mean that He is unchangeable self-existence, absolute personality. But there is no need of further proof of this. The tendency

[1] Gen. i. 4, 10, 12, 18, 26, 31, vi. 12 f., etc.
[2] Gen. vi. 13 ff., xvii. 1 ff.; Ex. xx. ff., etc.
[3] Gen. xvii. 1 ff.; Ex. xix.
[4] Gen. xxii. 16; Ex. xiii. 5, 11 (B), etc.
[5] Ex. iii. 14 (C); cf. Num. xiv. 21, 28 (A ?).

in the newer theology, which inclines to a less definitely personal conception of God, feels clearly enough its antagonism to the Mosaic idea of God, and lets this be seen in its depreciation of the Old Testament.

3. Much more naturally might it be asked whether this idea of God's personality is not so strongly emphasised that his spiritual life, His divinity, is thereby lost. It cannot be denied that in the earlier books of the Old Testament there certainly is an apparent humanisation of God. In fact, it cannot be otherwise. For the human mind cannot apprehend a personal, conscious, and independent life, save as human. Where it is not the language of the schools that is spoken, but the vivid and sensuous language of daily life, personal life can be described only by expressions borrowed from human life, and by speaking "the language of the children of men."[1] Hence no one who understands the essence of popular speech, and who is not perfectly incapable of appreciating the elevated tone of poetic diction, can possibly take offence at such expressions as God's hand, arm, mouth, eye, or at His speaking, walking, laughing, etc. In such expressions the activity of the living God is simply depicted after the manner of human acts, in the naïve style of popular poetic language. Nor will any reasonable man imagine that such expressions make it impossible for the writers who use them to have a perfect idea of a spiritual God, although, of course, they occur only where a personal and religious relationship to God is in question, not a philosophical knowledge of the Absolute. This style of speech runs quite freely through the whole of the Old Testament. The prophets of the most different ages represent God's acts by metaphors from human life. God appears as a Warrior, as One treading a wine-press, as a roaring Lion. He answers out of the whirlwind. He writes, mocks, swears, cries aloud; He calls like a keeper of bees; He musters His army of Medes, raises His banner, brandishes

[1] לשון בני־אדם, Maimon. fol. 1, in *Baumgarten-Crusius*, p. 179.

His sword—a sharp and powerful one—and makes bare His holy arm. His voice is the pealing thunder.[1] These metaphors taken just at random, the like of which we can find in all the more imaginative Old Testament writers, show us clearly that what the prophets were most anxious about was to produce, in no doubtful fashion, the conception of a living, personal, acting God. Of course, they could not do it in any other way, because their religion had its original foundations, not in a philosophy but in the brightly coloured, naïvely sensuous conceptions of a nature-religion.

4. It is equally certain that the historical books of the prophetic period did not give up the habit which the earlier narratives had of representing God as appearing and acting like a man under the limitations of time and space. In the exilic age greater care was taken; and A shows a marked difference in this respect from B and C. But even he does not hesitate to conceive of the Divine presence as sensible, and to connect it with the sacred ark.[2] In fact, the declaration that God buried Moses seems due to him.[3]

But the perfect poetic freedom with which, in poetry, the approach of God is described in all the splendour of the grandest natural phenomena is, in my opinion, a proof that we must not infer from such pictures a really sensuous conception of the divine acts. For, had that been the case, the poets would have carefully kept to certain definite metaphors. Hence we have the right to assume that even in the narratives in question which are likewise clothed in poetic diction, the representations of God's coming are

[1] B. J. xlii. 13, lix. 17 ff., lxiii. 3; Hos. v. 14, xiii. 8; Jer. xxv. 30; Job xxxviii. 1, xl. 6; Deut. x. 4; Ps. xxxvii. 13, lix. 9; B. J. xlii. 14; Amos iv. 2, vi. 8, viii. 7; Deut. i. 8, 34, ii. 15, iv. 21, vi. 23, vii. 8, 12; Isa. vii. 18, 20; B. J. xiii. 4; Jer. xlvii. 6; Isa. v. 26; B. J. xxvii. 1, xxxiv. 5 ff., lii. 10, lxii. 8; Amos i. 2; Ezek. x. 5; Joel ii. 11.

[2] Gen. xvii. 1, 22, xxxv. 9, 13; cf. Num. xi. 16, xii. 9, xiv. 11 ff.

[3] Deut. xxxiv. 6. Generally, however, in A the presence of God is simply equivalent to the appearance of the pillar of fire (Lev. ix. 4 (vi. 23), xvi. 2; Num. ix. 16, xii. 5, xiv. 10).

meant, not as historical accounts of actual manifestations of God, but as the free poetic drapery of His self-revealing activity.

As in early days, the song of Deborah and the psalm of David depict to us God's approach in all the grandeur of the tempest,[1] so we meet with similar descriptions all through the prophetic age.[2] God goes before Israel; He rides upon the heavens, on the light clouds; He comes forth out of His holy place.[3] In heaven is His throne, His holy palace, whence He regardeth the children of men. It is He who pierced the fleeing serpent, that is, the cloud-dragon that darkens the light of heaven;[4] who made heaven and earth—heaven for Himself, earth for man.[5] Later, Ezekiel, in vision, pictures God in full detail as present in a definite place.[6] And in like manner, in the life of Elijah, we are told, in a story as beautiful as it is pregnant with meaning, that whirlwind, earthquake, and fire passed before the prophet's eye without the Divine presence being in these phenomena; but at last he heard a voice gentle as a whisper, and God was in the voice.[7] But as the last passage is clearly intended to explain in what way

[1] Judg. v. 4 ff.; Ps. xviii. 8 ff. (1 Sam. ii. 9 ff.; Judg. iv. 14).

[2] 2 Sam. v. 24; Deut. xxxii. 10 ff.; Ps. xxxv. 1 ff., l. 3, lxviii. 5, 8 ff., 34, xcvii. 2 ff., cxliv. 5 ff.; B. J. lxvi. 15.

[3] Deut. xxxiii. 26 (i. 30, 33, 42, xxxi. 3, 8); Micah i. 3; Nahum i. 3 ff.; Hab. iii. 3 ff.; B. J. xxvi. 21; Isa. xix. 1.

[4] Deut. xxvi. 15; Micah i. 2; Jer. xxv. 30; Isa. vi. 1 ff.; B. J. lxiii. 15 (that, in Isa. vi., the prophet means to depict the heavenly palace of God is evident from the whole description, according to which the seraphim stand round about God as He sits on a high and lofty throne, the spacious apartment not being divided into a holy place and a holy of holies, and the altar of incense being set up in the throne-room itself); cf. Job xxvi. 13, iii. 8.

[5] Ps. cxv. 15 f.

[6] Ezek. i. 26, iii. 12; cf. i. 28, iii. 23, viii. 4, x. 4, 18 ff., xi. 22 ff.

[7] 1 Kings xix. 11 f. A.V., a still small voice; R.V. (margin), a sound of gentle stillness. (In Ps. xlviii. 3, Hitzig and Ewald understand the expression, "The corner of the north, the city of the great king," as if Zion were described as "the mountain of the gods in the north." In itself, the poetic application of this Asiatic mythological idea would be quite possible. But the brevity and unintelligibility of the expression appear to me to tell against it, and I cannot see that it would be unworthy of the poet to mention in this way the

God reveals His essential attributes, Ezekiel also makes his description more precise in this respect by saying that he saw God's glory, that is, the self-imposed Form in which God reveals Himself. We cannot imagine that the meaning of the other prophets was different. Only this much is certain, that the importance attached to God's transcendental character and the anxiety to distinguish Him from everything material, which began with A and grew stronger and stronger after Ezra, was quite foreign to pre-exilic saints.

But, although we frankly admit that, until the Exile, pious Israelites knew nothing of a spiritual nature in God which would have prevented them from conceiving of Him as materially alive, and even that they would have had difficulty in understanding the distinction between God and matter, we must with equal emphasis deny that the traits we have sketched justify us in maintaining that the Old Testament writers conceived of God as actually conditioned by matter and space. They speak like materialists, simply because they have not yet clearly apprehended the distinction between spirit and matter. But what they mean to teach regarding God is not His entanglement in mundane conditions, but His power over space and time. All legend, and therefore sacred legend too, represents what is transcendental under sensible, tangible forms. The barriers between heaven and earth, between the spiritual and the material life, vanish. Unless this were so, legend would never acquire that peculiarly fascinating, child-like grace which constitutes its greatest charm. The more perfect, spiritual, and poetic its form becomes, the freer will it be in this respect. Even the later narratives speak of God in a freely poetic and sensuous style. But descriptions such as occur in B, C, and in the book of Judges, are not found in later times. Besides the way in which the Israelites originally confined the presence of God to their own sanct-

geographical position of Zion—in the extreme north of the little kingdom of Judah.

uaries was not unobjectionable from a religious standpoint; and against it the prophets expressed themselves clearly and openly.[1]

5. In every period of this religion it is quite customary to apply to the inner life of God the feelings and motives of human life, and the sentiments of the human heart. In such expressions there must, from the nature of the case, be something inappropriate, something not quite in harmony with a perfectly spiritual conception of God. For a human soul, in all its life and motives, necessarily shares in the frailties, passions, and limitations of a creature; and accordingly there cannot but cling to any expressions descriptive of that life, a something limited, and "anthropopathic," which does not accord with a perfectly spiritual being. Hence to ascribe to God love, hatred, jealousy, fear, wrath, repentance, scorn, etc., is, so far as form is concerned, manifestly inappropriate.[2] But without such epithets a conscious personal life could not be described at all in popular language. If these are taken away, there remains nothing but a cheerless baldness of metaphor which cannot interest a pious heart. They offer certainly in an inadequate form, but still in the only possible one, that which is more important for religion than any philosophical speculations about God. They give us a glimpse of the fulness of God's inner life, that very life by means of which the ways of divine revelation become explicable. They show us a personal God whose heart overflows with love to His own, with love which cannot see itself rejected and yet remain coldly indifferent, a God whose faithfulness and truth are ever in conflict with sin; the very God whom the whole history of salvation proclaims, and whose most perfect revelation in living act is Jesus' death of love. These "anthropomorphisms," then, are in no sense a dimming

[1] Jer. iii. 16; 1 Kings viii. 27 ff.; cf. Deut. i. 42.

[2] *E.g.* Gen. iii. 22, vi. 6 f., xi. 6; Ex. xxxii. 10 ff., 14; Ps. ii. 4, and often.

of the perfect idea of God; but they contain, although in popular dress, the really positive part of the statements regarding Him. They become the more prominent, the warmer religion becomes. While post-canonical Judaism, in its emptiness and baldness, shuns them, and the Alexandrian school with its intellect dazzled by the splendour of Hellenic speculation is ashamed to own them, Jesus shows them special favour. The prophets cling with the utmost determination to this style of speech. They preach a jealous God, who does not permit Himself to be mocked with impunity,[1] and a merciful God who is ready to turn from His resolve, who is ready to forgive.[2] They talk frequently and emphatically of God's anger and zeal, of His love which longs to pardon, of His sorrow for His people's sins, of His joy in human virtue, and of His "repentance." They tell how God laughs, in sublime scorn, at man's pride; and how He consoles Himself and takes vengeance on His enemies.[3] In fact, this freedom of representation goes so far that the poet makes God say that Satan beguiled Him into destroying Job without cause.[4] In the prophetic period, therefore, the full personality of a living God who feels and wills, is insisted on even more strongly than before.

The incongruity of form, inseparable from such expressions, is easily explained away. The repentance of God,—since it is likewise stated that His decrees remain immutable, He not being a man that He should lie,[5]—grows into the assured conviction that human development is not for Him an empty indifferent spectacle, that it is just this inner immutability of His being which excludes that dull, dead unchangeableness

[1] 2 Kings xvii. 7 ff., xxiii. 26 ff.

[2] 2 Kings xxii. 19 f.; Jonah iv. 11; Joel ii. 18.

[3] Isa. ii. 9–21, i. 24, iii. 8, ix. 7, xxx. 27, 30, xxxvii. 32; Deut. vi. 15, xxxii. 16, 35, 41 ff.; Job. i. 8, ii. 3; Jer. xviii. 8, 10, 11, xxiii. 19 f., xxv. 37, xxx. 24, xxxii. 31, 37, xxxiii. 9, xxxvi. 7, xlii. 10 f., l. 15, 28, li. 6, 11, 36, 56; Ezek. xxv. 14, 17; B. J. xiii. 13, xxvi. 11, xxxv. 4, xlii. 25, xlvii. 3, lix. 17 f.; 1 Sam. xv. 11, 35.

[4] Job ii. 3. [5] Gen. vi. 6 ff.; cf. Num. xxiii. 19; 1 Sam. xv. 11; cf. 29.

which remains outwardly the same, however much circumstances may change. Since God is represented as the bestower of blessing, and as rejoicing to give life to all His creatures, His jealousy is meant to express that He is not an unconscious natural force, which pours out its fulness in utter indifference, but that human love exercises an influence over Him. Since God is represented as mocking at the rage of the peoples, His fear must indicate that He is a God who sets a definite aim before Him, who constantly keeps the development of the world within the limits of His eternal decrees, and that His wisdom does not tolerate the self-boasting of short-sighted man. God's wrath and hatred, taken in connection with His gracious power, are standing expressions for the self-asserting majesty of His living essence. We have, therefore, in the words before us, simply a non-scholastic phraseology and a purely religious interest.

6. We thus obtain the following picture. It is not the spirituality of God, least of all in the sense of a philosophical conception of the Absolute, that forms the basis of the Old Testament belief in God, but His full living personality, which is nevertheless involuntarily conceived of as human. In earlier times, the people unquestionably thought of God as actually connected in a material way with the special forms and manifestations by which He revealed Himself; and the language of sacred legend estimates His acts by standards perfectly applicable to human conduct. But it is equally certain that He is, from the first, thought of as "Elohim"—that is, so far as this can be expressed by a non-philosophical idea, He is thought of as raised quite above creature limitations and weaknesses. Nor is this certainty disturbed either by the language of the whole Old Testament, which describes Him, with all the frankness of poetic licence, as coming, appearing, and acting, in an altogether human and natural fashion, or by the fact that

a life of the soul is attributed to Him, which is thought of as developing in the very way in which the life of a human soul develops.

A doctrine of the divine spirituality, in the philosophical sense, is of course nowhere found in the Old Testament, not even in the prophets. God is not spoken of as *a Spirit* (the one passage that points in this direction, Isa. xxxi. 3, is explained later on); it is *the Spirit of God* that is spoken of: that is to say, as the full inner life of reason and will is, in the case of man, described as spirit, so too, in the case of God, a similar fulness of strength, energy, and life, is thought of, which is then also capable of proceeding forth from Him as an active *supra-mundane* principle. And this Spirit of God is, like the spirit of man, conceived of as more or less material. Hence we read of the glowing breath of a wrathful God, of the blast of the breath of His nostrils. As the thunder is the voice of God, so the whirlwind is His breath.[1] And in not a few passages this Spirit of God is represented as very independent; as in the long run every influence proceeding from a person (wisdom, word, or spirit), can be poetically represented as independent within its own sphere of influence. It is so in B. J. lxiii. 10.[2] For when it is said, "they grieved His holy spirit," it is certainly the spirit of prophecy put upon Moses and the prophets that is meant. But this spirit is itself a divine power. And in Ezek. xxxvii. 9 ff., at any rate the Spirit of God is thought of as very independent. The same is true of B. J. xlviii. 16, if that passage is to be translated, "The Lord Jehovah and His Spirit," that is, Jehovah with His Spirit has sent me (the prophet).

[1] Gen. i. 2, viii. 1; Ex. xv. 8, 10 (Deut. xxxii. 11); Ps. xviii. 9, 16, xxix.; Hos. xiii. 15; thus already in early passages but continuing down even to the latest days.

[2] If from the mention of Jehovah, the Angel, and the Spirit, the Trinity has been discovered in this passage, it is hard to say why the arm of Jehovah, in the 12th verse, should not be taken as a fourth person.

Hence even in prophecy the spirituality of God is conceived of not in a metaphysical but in an anthropological and popular sense, as "intelligence clothed with human attributes" (de Wette). In contrast with the material, that is, the needy, dependent being, eager for enjoyment and outward satisfaction, and tied down to a definite outward form, God is spiritual, Elohim, that is, perfect, independent, and in need of nothing. He is the living God, the God of life, in whom life is present as a property, and that, too, an inalienable property.[1] He is in need of nothing, and seeks no sensuous enjoyment; this being expressly taught, in opposition to a false idea of sacrifice.[2] In contrast with the gods of wood and stone, He has no image. On Horeb, Israel heard a voice, but did not see a form. It is on this that the Deuteronomist bases the prohibition of images—a prohibition he certainly was not the first to issue.[3] And wherever God's revealed glory is depicted, there is always light—the most spiritual element in the world of sense—light, at once the veil and the revelation of God.[4] He is not afraid of the material. The world and the mass of heathen peoples are to him as nothing, as the drop of a bucket.[5] He needs no outward experience; is not dependent on external impressions. For He knows the heart,[6] and has not eyes of flesh,[7] which an optical illusion can deceive. He is the Creator who, by His mere word, makes the world come forth, and with it time and space.[8] Accordingly, if one wishes to express in a single word the antithesis between God and His creature, then *God* and *man* may be contrasted as *Spirit* and *flesh;* just as what is transcendental, independent, and self-existent, is contrasted with

[1] Deut. v. 23, xxxii. 40; Jer. x. 10.
[2] Ps. l. 7 ff.; B. J. xl. 16.
[3] Deut. iv. 12, 15 ff., 23, v. 6 ff. (xvi. 21); Ex. xx. 4.
[4] Ps. civ. 1 ff.
[5] B. J. xl. 15 ff.
[6] 1 Sam. xvi. 7; Ps. xliv. 22, cxxxix. 23 f.
[7] Job x. 4. (Here already we have the antithesis of flesh and spirit.) Ps. cxxi. 4.
[8] Gen. i.

what is material, frail, and transient. In point of fact, this conception of Isaiah's comes very near to what is doctrinally expressed in the New Testament by the words "God is Spirit."[1]

The significance this spirituality of God has for religion is already insisted on by the saints who lived prior to the eighth century. The narrative by C gets out of the divine name Jehovah the idea of absolute self-existence, and consequently teaches that God is original, absolute, independent life—that is, Spirit.[2] C thinks that even Moses could not *look upon* God but could only *look after* Him,—recognise Him by the traces of His working;[3] and he teaches, like Deuteronomy, that Israel is not to make any idols, because at the mount he had a direct perception only of the *voice* of God.[4] The oldest Psalms speak of God seeing the hearts of men.[5] Hence the early saints knew of this spirituality, that is, they understood the significance of the name Elohim.

7. The age of the Scribes takes a much greater interest in freeing the idea of God from sensuous elements. Even then, of course, we have to deal only with a tendency, not with final results. In point of fact, every utterance which the age before Ezra had made regarding God was considered by the later ages as still authoritative. And in many places, especially where, as in Daniel and Chronicles,[6] passages from the earlier Psalms are imitated and utilised, the old idea of God meets us in full vitality and bloom. The magnificent description of God in Daniel is not second to any passage in the prophets.[7] God is represented, even in Chronicles, as in living union, perceptible even to the eye of sense, with the

[1] Isa. xxxi. 3. [2] Ex. iii. 14. [3] Ex. xxxiii. 23; cf. 18, 11, 9, xxxiv. 15.
[4] Ex. xx. 22. [5] *E.g.* Ps. vii. 10, xi. 4, 5.
[6] 1 Chron. xvi. 8 ff., xxviii. 9, xxix. 10 ff.; 2 Chron. vi. 14 ff., vii. 14, 16, xvi. 7 ff., xix. 6, xxv. 8 ff., xxx. 9, 18, xxxii. 7 f.; Dan. ii. 19 ff., 22, 46, iii. 17, 28 ff., v. 23, ix. 9, 14; Ezra v. 11 ff., x. 14; Neh. ii. 12, i. 5 f., ix. 5 ff., 17, 27, 31.
[7] Dan. vii. 9.

forms of revelation adopted by Himself.[1] And of God's mercy, truth, and righteousness, as well as of His answering prayer, there is frequent enough mention.[2]

But, while in Ezekiel's whole conception of revelation the more transcendental view of God is already unmistakable,[3] from Ezra's time onwards any comparison of God with other Elohim becomes more and more meaningless. The unity of God has become one of the most valuable and important possessions of knowledge, not merely from the religious standpoint, but from the theological and metaphysical as well. His incomparable and transcendental character is so self-evident, that it seems impossible to do enough in the way of representing Him as a Being removed as far as possible from all connection with human beings and human feelings, and of depicting Him in the most abstract and exalted terms. Hence the names "God of Heaven," "Most High God," begin to be used,[4] and are even put into heathen mouths.[5] Instead of the living name for Israel's covenant God, the preacher Solomon uses the more abstract term Elohim. In Chronicles, too, it is found more frequently than in the earlier books.[6] And the second collection of Psalms, which was made at this time quite independently of the first book,[7] regularly insists on substituting "Elohim" for "Jehovah," even where this alteration produces combinations manifestly impossible,[8] as if it were afraid to name the living, self-revealing God of the

[1] 1 Chron. xiii. 3, xiv. 10, 14, 15, xv. 3.

[2] Ezra ix. 15; Neh. ix. 8, 33, 20, viii. 10; 1 Chron. iv. 10, v. 20; Dan. vi. 27, etc.

[3] Ezek. i., iii., viii., x.

[4] Ezra v. 11 ff., vi. 10, vii. 12, 21, 23; Neh. i. 4 f., ii. 4, 20; Dan. ii. 18 f., 28, 37, 44, iv. 23, 24, v. 18, 23; Ps. cxxxvi. 26 (Jonah i. 9).

[5] *E.g.* Neh. ix. 27 f.; Ezra i. 2; 2 Chron. xxxvi. 23. (Cf. also the predicates, Eccles. iii. 14, v. 1, vii. 15, xi. 5.)

[6] 1 Chron. iv. 10, v. 20, 25, vi. 33 f., xii. 22, xiii. 12, xiv. 10, 14, 16, xv. 15, xvi. 1; indeed constantly where it does not quote its authorities literally.

[7] As the two-fold insertion of the same Psalms shows, Ps. xiv. 2, 4; cf. liii. 3, 6, xl. 14, 17; cf. lxx. 2, 5.

[8] Such as the אלהים אלהיך, Ps. xlv. 8.

covenant, or as if it saw in the mere naming of God a dishonouring of the divine majesty. In this way Elohim becomes the name of God in use during the Levitical period.

With this tendency the excessive fondness for miracles that is seen in Daniel, and afterwards in the second and third books of the Maccabees, is closely connected.[1] For the more God is withdrawn from all connection with the ordinary course of existence, the more unintelligible and unconnected does His action become, when He does interfere with the world. The revelation must be brought about by means of the outward acts of subordinate beings. Prophetic inspiration is now understood only as a vision or a dream. God is believed to have "spoken" only in "primeval times." Naturally, among a people in possession of the Old Testament, the simple living conception of God's relation to the world could not utterly disappear even in later times. The idea of God in Tobit and in Jesus the son of Sirach is, on the whole, in accordance with Old Testament piety; and even the book of the Wisdom of Solomon has, in spite of some Hellenistic touches, a very beautiful conception of God, based on the writings of the prophets. It specially deserves to be mentioned that in this book God is represented as the Father of the upright, by means of Wisdom. Thus we have here the idea of an ethical divine sonship, formed upon similarity of being, a sonship which is based on the love of the "Lord who loveth souls."[2]

But the later Hellenism, of which Philo is the chief exponent, is particularly fond of conceiving God as "pure Being," the self-existent, the truly existent, without name or attribute; unchangeable, without relation to time, without

[1] Dan. i. 15, iii. 25, 32, ii. 19, v. 5, vi. 23, iv. 30; cf. 2 Macc. iii. 24ff., v. 2ff., x. 29, xi. 8, xv. 11 ff.; Tob. vi. 2, 4, 7 f.; 3 Macc. v. 11, 30, vi. 18 f., ii. 22.

[2] Wisd. Sol. ii. 13, 16, 18, etc., xi. 26 f. (Ecclus. iv. 10). This thought had certainly quite as much influence on the ideas of Jesus regarding the divine Sonship as had the theocratic conception of Israel and of its king as the Son of God. In xi. 17, the expression ἐξ ἀμόρφου ὕλης is probably an allusion to the Alexandrine idea of an eternal world-substance.

desire, blessed, equal only to Himself.[1] In the Pentateuch the Septuagint changes the self-revealing God into the angel of God, or into the place and glory[2] of God; and it takes the heathen gods to be demons.[3] Even in passages which have otherwise a warm religious tone, the more negative conception of the spiritually exalted God of heaven frequently prevails over the more strongly religious character of the real God of Israel.[4] And we have speculation already begun as to the divine names, and also the superstitious idea that an oath by the secret name of God[5] is of the utmost efficacy.[6]

It is certainly for the same reason that the idea of God in these books is, in most cases, gratifyingly free from the harsh and offensively sensuous forms in which the Old Testament idea of God is often expressed. But this greater smoothness and purity is in reality not an evidence of a higher religious stage, but the result of greater exhaustion. Where there is more thought than feeling, there exists, it is true, a more exact picture of eternal things. But the inner life is wanting. In the sphere of religion sober understanding is not so high a gift as warm and living feeling.

CHAPTER VIII.

REVELATION AND NAMES OF GOD.

LITERATURE.—On the idea of revelation cf. Steudel, *l.c.*, 236 f., 240 f., 252. Hengstenberg, *Christologie*, 3*b*. 27–86.

[1] ὁ ὤν, τὸ ὄν, τὸ ὄντως ὄν Philo 296–298, 122 D, 128 A B, 815 C E, 816 C, 916 B, 950, 1045 B, 1046, 1048 D, 1087 A, 1093 C, 1142 E, 1150, 1103 D.

[2] Cf. Langen, *l.c.*, ccii. 2 ff., ccx. (Septuagint of Lev. xxiv. 16; Deut. xxxii. 8, 43; Ex. xxiv. 10; Num. xii. 8, etc.).

[3] Septuagint, Ps. xcvi. 5.

[4] Tob. i. 13, v. 26, x. 12; 2 Macc. xv. 4. 23; Jud. v. 7, vi. 20, xi. 17, etc.

[5] *Die Sibylle bei Friedlieb*, xv. 140 ff.

[6] *Enoch*, translated by Dillmann, lxix. 14 ff.

—On the meaning of the names of God: Oehler (2nd ed., Orelli) in Herzog's *Realencyclopædie,* art. "Namen."—On the names of God: Hitzig, "Ueber die Gottesnamen im Alten Testamente" (*Hilgenfeld Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.* xviii. 1). Dillmann, art. "Ueber Baal mit dem weibl. Artikel" (*Monatsber. d. kgl. Akad. d. Wiss. zu Berlin,* 16th July 1881). Th. Nöldeke, "Ueber den Gottesnamen El" (*Monatsb. d. kgl. Akad. d. Wiss. zu Berlin,* 14th Oct. 1888); cf. *Zeitschr. d. deutsch-morgenl. Ges.* xxxv. 162, 502; *Sitzungsber. d. Berl. Akad.* 1882, 1175 ff. De Lagarde, *Abh. d. Gött. Ges. d. Wiss.* 1st May 1880. *Nachrichten v. d. kgl. Ges. d. W. zu Gött.* 1882, 173 ff.; 1886, 147 ff. *Mittheilungen,* 107 ff., 222 ff. Oehler (Kautzsch), art. "Elohim" (supplement to Herzog). Dr. Eberhard Nestle, *Die israelitischen Eigennamen nach ihrer religionsgeschichtlichen Bedeutung,* 1876). Dietrich, *Abh. zur hebräischen Grammatik,* 1846, p. 44 f.; cf. 16.—On the word Jahve: Schrader, art. "Jahve" in Schenkel's *Reallexicon.* Land, "Over den Godsnamen יהוה en den Titel נביא" (*Theol. Tijdschr.* 1868, 156 ff.). *Noch jets over den Godsnamen* יהוה 1869, 3. Fr. Delitzsch, "Die neue Methode der Herleitung des Gottesnamens יהוה" (*Zeitschr. f. d. g. lutherische Theol. u. Kirche* 1877, 4. (But cf. the essays of Fr. Delitzsch and the letters by Dietrich, published by him, *Zeitschr. f. alttest. Wiss.* i. 173, ii. 173, iii. 280, iv. 21.) De Lagarde, *D. M. Z.* 1868, 331. *Psalterium juxta Hebræos Hieronymi* 1874, Coroll. Nestle, *Jahrb. f. d. Theol.* 1878, i. 126. Reland, *Decas exercitationum philologicarum de vera pronuntiatione nominis Jchovah* 1707, 423 ff. Ewald, *Gesch. d. V. Israel,* ii. 203 ff.; *Jahrb.* ix. 102, x. 20. Köhler, *De pronuntiatione ac vi sacrosancti tetragrammatis* 1867. Movers, *Phönicier,* i. 159. Baudissin, "Der Ursprung des Gottesnamens *Ἰάω*" (*l.c.,* 181–254). Stade, p. 346. Kuenen, i. 399. Kautzsch, *Zeitschr. f. altt. Wiss.* 1886, vi. 17 ff. Philippi, "Ist יהוה accad-sumerischen Inhalts?" (*Zeitschr. f. Völkerpsychologie u. Sprachw.* 1883, 2). Jablonsky, *Panth. æg.* i. 1750, ii. 1752; i. 250.

Diodorus Siculus, i. 94 (ed. Dind. i. 125). Hieronymus on *Psalm VIII.* Philo Byblius in *Euseb. Præp. ev.* Dind. i. 37 (31*a*). Origenes, ed. de la Rue, i. 656, 7, ii. 49, 539. Epiphanius, *Adv. hær.* i. 3, 20. Clemens Alexandrinus, *Strom.* v. 562 (ed. Potter, 666). Macrobius Saturninus, i. 18. Demetrius Phalereus in *Euseb. Præp. evang.* (ed. Dind. ii. 16, 519*d*, 520*a*). Theodoret (ed. Sirm.), *Quæst. in Paral.* i. 364; *Quæst. in Ex. XV.* i. 86. *Fab. hær.* iv. 260, v. 3 f. Hesychius *zu* *Ὀζείας u. Ἰωαθάμ.*—On the name Zebaoth cf. Fr. Delitzsch, *Zeitschr. f. luth. Theol.* 1874. Eberhard Schrader, "Der ursprüngliche Sinn des Gottesnamens Jahve Zebaoth" (*Jahrb. f. protest. Theol.* i. 316 ff.).

1. God, as the source of all the life in the world, and, therefore also of man's, cannot be reached by human effort as such. If man is to have aught of God, he can receive it only from God, who is lovingly self-communicating. That is Israel's belief from the first. No narrator dealing with primitive days ever thinks of man as raising himself up to God by his own act. From the first, God is the speaker, man the hearer, and a hearer too very childlike and weak in understanding.[1] God reveals Himself; man calls reverently on His name.[2] The religion of Israel comes into existence by God appearing, speaking, commanding, and by man obeying and believing. So it is with Abraham and so it is at Sinai.[3] Moses and all the men of God after him are not philosophers who ponder over the mysteries of the transcendental world, but prophets whom God permits to know Him. The word יָדַע, which is used in the Old Testament for the knowledge of God, denotes a knowledge gained by living communion, by actual experience.

Such a knowledge of God, resting upon His self-communica-

[1] Gen. ii. 16, iii. 3, 6, 8 ff. [2] Gen. iv. 1 ff., 6 ff., 26, vii. 1 (vi. 13 f.).
[3] Ex. xix. ff. The passages in B and C, from Gen. xii. onwards, are too numerous to be mentioned separately. Even A holds resolutely to this idea (Gen. xvii. 1 ff.; Ex. vi. 3 ff.).

tion, is everywhere presupposed by the Old Testament as *actually present*. The ancient people undoubtedly thought of Jehovah revealing Himself in a very material and tangible fashion, in theophanies or appearances of the angel of God, in dream and omen, by the mouth of the priest who interprets the sacred signs, and of the prophet who is grasped by the hand of God or seized by His Spirit.[1] But, on the whole, the conviction that revelations of the living God take place, is one common to every period down to the Exile. God is not a God who hides Himself in the sense of shutting His life up within Himself. His Spirit streams forth into all the world, generating and preserving life, and awakening in men, wheresoever He will, a supernatural inspiration, in which they behold the divine. His word[2] goes forth to the world and it comes into being; it goes forth to the prophets and they know Him and proclaim His will. His messengers, in whom His will makes itself known, find the men of God. His glory comes near to His favoured ones in the holy places. He appears and reveals Himself to the spiritual eye of the inspired, in dream and vision. Such is the revelation presupposed in the stories and legends of Israel, from Adam to Moses.[3] The prophets are conscious of it in their own souls.[4] The prophetic law promises it also for the ages to come.[5] And that this communication of God is a reality and a truth is the fundamental proposition by which this whole religion stands or falls.[6]

This religion, it is true, never imagines itself in possession

[1] *E.g.* Ex. iv. 24, xii. 23; Num. xxii. 22; 2 Sam. xxiv. 16; 2 Kings xix. 35; cf. Judg. vi. 36; 1 Sam. iii. 3 ff.; 1 Kings xx. 23. (The "voice of God," Deut. iv. 12; 1 Sam. iii. 4; 1 Kings xix. 11 ff.)

[2] Ps. xxxiii. 6.

[3] Gen. ii. 16, xii., xv.; Ex. xix., xxxiii. 11.

[4] Isa. vi. 5; Jer. i; Deut. iv. 33, v. 24.

[5] Deut. xviii. 15.

[6] The later idea of the Shechina has its biblical foundation in "God's dwelling" in Israel (Eden, Heaven, the Temple), Deut. xii. 5, 11, xiv. 23; 1 Kings viii. 12; the expression Bath-Qol in "the voice of God," *e.g.* 1 Sam. iii. 4; Deut. iv. 12; 1 Kings xix. 11 ff.

of a perfect communication from this God that exhaustively explains His being. No created being can contain the fulness of Deity. In this sense, certainly, God is a God that hideth Himself. The childlike character of legendary presentation may well allow the God of heaven and earth to hold intercourse, like a man, with His elect. But this disappears along with the language of legend. Even Moses, the most highly favoured of all God's servants, can, according to the early narrative, see only the glory of God or His back—that is to say, only the effect of His personality, only the form that the invisible God of light chooses to take.[1] Where God communicates Himself by speech, it is more accurate to say that "the angel of God" has spoken—that is, there has been, not an absolute self-communication, but one made through being conditioned in a creature, through a form imposed on His infinite being, whereby it is neither exhausted nor limited. Indeed the Old Testament considers, as the ancients usually did, that whoever actually sees God must perish, die, become, as it were, "banned," because contact with the High and Holy One would make him unfit for this earth of ours, would consume his earthly being. This idea is firmly rooted in the popular belief even with regard to angels.[2] It is the same in Isaiah as in B, C. If any one were to see the face of God, he would die.[3] Whoever saw God and "lived thereafter," has to tell of wonderful mercy shown him.[4] Before God's holy glance, a creature of earth in its nothingness and impurity must shrivel into dust.[5] This idea was also transferred, by the reverence of early days as well as by the awe inculcated by the scribes, to the holy forms of divine revelation, and, most of all, to the ark of God in which the early community unquestionably saw, in a very realistic fashion,

[1] Ex. xxxiii. 20 ff.
[2] Judg. vi. 23, xiii. 22; Gen. xxxii. 30 (C).
[3] Ex. xxxiii. 20 (C); Deut. iv. 33, v. 23; Isa. vi. 4 ff.
[4] Ex. xxiv. 11 (B). [5] Ex. xix. 12 f., 21, xx. 19; iii. 6.

the presence of God. For an unconsecrated person to look into the ark or touch it, was death.[1]

Hence there can be no question, either of an exhaustive apprehension of God or of a self-acquired knowledge of His being. God must open the eye of the spirit before a man can understand His truth; God must first speak to him.[2] The bold titanic spirit that thought it could storm the gates of heaven must, with shame and confusion of face, sue for pardon in reverent silence.[3] The later prophetic age still teaches that "every man is brutish and without knowledge,"[4] and believes that God is a God who hideth Himself; and that "it is His glory to conceal a thing."[5] It is but the reflection of His splendour, but the image of His glory, that is visible to man. Even the prophets see Him only in figure and vision. They venture to paint in words only His surroundings, not Himself.[6] And wisdom, the possession of which would guide to the secret of the divine being, is not to be found by any creature, is not to be gained by human toil, or got in return for earthly treasure. Destruction and Death say: "We have heard a rumour thereof with our ears."[7]

The true wisdom in which this God reveals Himself is only to be found in the fear of God. Its conditions are moral, the way to it is religious. The wicked "know not God."[8] The knowledge of God unfolds itself to him who willeth to serve God.[9] This religion has, by the eighth century, thoroughly exploded the old heathen notion which kept holy inspiration entirely apart from morality. God lets Himself be found even when He is not sought for,[10] but only by the upright. To them He is willing to reveal Himself at

[1] 1 Sam. vi. 19 ff.; 2 Sam vi. 7; cf. Ex. xxviii. 35, xxx. 21; Lev. xvi. 2, 13.
[2] Num. xxii. 31, xxiv. 4; Isa. xxii. 14.
[3] Job xl. 2 ff., xlii. 1 f.
[4] Jer. li. 17; Job iv. 19; Ps. xlix. 73.
[5] B. J. xlv. 15; cf. Job xxvi. 14, xxxvi. 26 f., xxxvii. 15 ff. (Prov. xxv. 2, xxx. 1–4).
[6] So Isa. vi. and Ezek. i. 10; cf. Job xi. 6; Ps. cxlvii. 5.
[7] Job xxviii. 12, 20, 22.
[8] *E.g.* Ps. liii. 2.
[9] *E.g.* Job. xxviii. 28.
[10] B. J. lxv. 1.

any time; not merely in the monuments of a bygone age, but in the living present, in the experience of the pious and the upright in heart.[1] He can be seen,[2] not with the bodily eye, nor with the glance of the speculative mind, but with the eye of inward vision which loses itself in reverential contemplation of the glory, blessedness, and truth of Israel's God. Thus a true, although naturally not an exhaustive,[3] knowledge of God is possible for one who, as a pious child of Israel, seeks God with humble heart in the ways which He Himself has appointed. The period after Ezra loses more and more the conviction of God's living revelation; and this tells in favour of a bygone age of revelation and its literature. Hence A already thinks that the self-same God who formerly spake with men, and especially with Moses, is now to be found only in His holy statutes and judgments. For the singers of Ps. i., xix.*b*, and cxix., revelation and Holy Scripture are already identical. And even where, as in Daniel and the Apocalypses, a present revelation is taken for granted, it no longer appears as a self-revelation of the living God, but as a communication from the transcendental God through special messengers, or through extraordinary excitement of the imagination.[4]

2. When God is in communication with men, they must have a name for Him. For the Hebrews, as for the earlier peoples in general, a name is no colourless appellation, serving merely for use. It must be more; it must really express the character of the person indicated and his real importance; or it must embody a declaration of faith, a hope which those who give the name connect with the person named. Thus in the first narrative by B, man's right to

[1] Ps. xxv. 12 ff., lxxvii. 3 f.

[2] Ps. xvii. 15, xxvii. 8, xlii. 3, etc. For the more exact meaning of the expression, cf. *supra* p. 81; cf. also Ewald, *Jahrbücher der biblischen Wissenschaft*, xi. p. 31 ff.

[3] Deut. xxix. 28. What is hidden is for God; what is revealed is for us and our children.

[4] Cf. 2 Chron. xxx. 27.

give names to the animals expresses his lordship over creation, the power which his knowledge gives him over the creatures. By their names he separates the animals from himself as not akin to him; but the "woman" (אִשָּׁה) he connects with himself as being of the same essence. Accordingly this narrator is fond of connecting with significant names incidents which explain their meaning. To the names Eve, Cain, Seth, Noah, Moses, etc., of course without any regard at all to the scientific derivation of the words, he attaches stories pregnant with instruction. In the same way prophecy is fond of embodying the principal ground-thoughts of the people's destiny in suggestive names, such as Lo-Ammi, Immanuel, Shear-Jashub, etc. Also in cases where the whole position and aim of a man's life are altered, a new name is readily granted him. Abram and Sarai become Abraham and Sarah; Jacob becomes Israel, Hosea Joshua, and Solomon Jedidiah.[1] A name corresponds to its object, as a word to a thought. It is the body on which the object stamps its impress. Hence man, too, has a name in relation to God. When God calls Moses "by name," He thereby places Himself in a personal relation to Moses as an individual, such as He has with no other. In other words, with men a name is, if not an expression of religious belief on the part of those who give it (a case not at present under consideration), the expression of the personal being of the particular individual, especially in relation to the highest questions.

Accordingly a divine name has to express whatever has been revealed or made known to man regarding the being of God. The name, in its absolute significance, is *the divine being, as revealed, making Himself intelligible to others.* Of this name and its glory, prophets and poets speak often and

[1] Gen. xvii. 5, 15, xxxii. 28; Num. xiii. 17. No doubt this is, in a very marked degree, a peculiarity of A, who actually makes even God change His name. Ex. vi. 3; 2 Sam. xii. 25 (John i. 42; Matt. xvi. 18; Mark iii. 17; Acts iv. 36).

[2] Ex. xxxiii. 12; cf. xxxi. 2 Bezaleel. So later, B. J. xliii. 1, xlv. 4.

gladly. In Israel[1] God's name is great, glorious, and excellent, as it is in all the earth. God will not give it to another,[2] but is jealous of it,[3] anxious that glory be given to it.[4] He cannot endure that where He has revealed Himself as God, or claimed something as His own, man should withhold it, or touch what is His. The name of God is something peculiarly holy. For His own name's sake, that is, because the honour of His revelation has once been staked upon this people, He will not reject Israel, but will glorify him, and guide the godly.[5] For this name of God the temple is built.[6] In this name the godly man walks, and Israel exults and boasts himself. This name is put upon Israel to bless him.[7] To it every one comes who bows before the might of Jehovah.[8] Since this name is on the angel who leads Israel, he acts as God's plenipotentiary.[9] And whenever God's revelation finds expression in His sanctuaries, there His name dwells.[10] The true Israel walks and acts[11] in the name of God. When the people of revelation is sunk in dishonour and in captivity, the name of God is scoffed at by the heathen.[12] God swears by His name. Indeed, this "name" can stand directly for God Himself as the almighty, self-revealing God. "The name of the God of Jacob set thee up on high."[13] Accordingly since the name of God denotes this God Himself as He is revealed, and as He desires to be known by His creatures,—when it is

[1] Jer. xliv. 26; Deut. xxviii. 58, xxxii. 3; Ezek. xxxix. 7, xliii. 8; cf. Jer. x. 6; Ps. viii. 2, lxxvi. 2.

[2] B. J. xlii. 8; cf. xliii. 21, xlviii. 11.

[3] Ezek. xx. 9, 14, 22, xxxix. 7, 25, xxxvi. 20.

[4] Deut. xxxii. 3; Mal. ii. 2; Ps. cii. 16, cxliii. 11 f.; Josh. vii. 9; Lev. xx. 3; cf. Ex. xxxii. 11 f.

[5] 1 Sam. xii. 22; B. J. xlviii. 9, 11; Ps. xxxi. 4, xxiii. 3, cxliii. 11 f.

[6] 1 Kings ix. 3; 2 Kings xxi. 4, 7, xxiii. 27; Deut. xii. 5, 11, xvi. 6, 11; Ps. xxvi. 8; Isa. xviii. 7; B. J. xxiv. 15.

[7] Num. vi. 27. [8] Josh. ix. 9. [9] Ex. xxiii. 21, cf. xxxiii. 14.

[10] 2 Sam. vii. 13; 1 Kings viii. 12 ff., xi. 36; Deut. xii. 5.

[11] Micah iv. 5, v. 3; Ps. xxxiii. 21, cxviii. 26.

[12] B. J. lii. 5 f.; Ps. lxxiv. 10, 18.

[13] Jer. x. 6, xliv. 26 (Ps. xx. 2, liv. 3; Isa. xxx. 27; Prov. xviii. 10; 1 Kings viii. 42; Gen. xlix. 24; שֵׁם instead of שֵׂם).

said that God will *make a name* for Himself by His mighty deeds, or that the new world of the future shall be unto Him for a name,[1] we can easily understand that the *name of God* is often synonymous with the *glory of God*, and that the expressions for both are combined in the utmost variety of ways, or used alternately.[2] A person who, by a curse or a frivolous oath, dishonours the "name," has insulted God and comes under the ban.[3]

Such being the significance of God's name, the various divine names are naturally of great importance, and are not to be lightly used. "Man may invent names for false gods, but the true God can be named by man only in so far as He reveals Himself to man by disclosing His essence" (Oehler). And since God is, in His inmost being, unsearchable, one can certainly conceive of a name of God which no one knows but Himself.[4] Even the angelic being who reveals God will not tell His name to a mortal.[5] And later Judaism, in forbidding the name Jehovah to be uttered, proceeded on the principle that it does not become a frail mortal to use a word that perfectly describes the divine essence. But such names of God the Old Testament does not know. Its divine names are definite revelations to men of God's essence, public names; and any attempt to make them secret again is a sign of fear and superstition. Since the name Jehovah is the proper personal name of the God of Israel, as contrasted with strange gods, the expression "I am Jehovah" is often in His mouth to denote His own uniqueness and majesty.[6] This is especially the case in the Law, where this name, in fact, indicates the close of divine revelation.[7]

[1] Jer. xxxii. 20, xxxiii. 2; B. J. lv. 13, lxiii. 12, 14, lxiv. 1.

[2] With כבוד, or נאון, נאות, B. J. xxiv. 15, xxvi. 10; Micah v. 3; Mal. ii. 2; Ps. cii. 16, xcvi. 7, xxix. 1 ff.

[3] Ex. xx. 7; Lev. xxiv. 11.

[4] As in the New Testament Apocalypse, iii. 12, etc.

[5] Gen. xxxii. 29; cf. Judg. xiii. 18.

[6] Ex. xv. 3; Jer. xlviii. 15, li. 19, 57; B. J. xlii. 8; Ps. lxviii. 5.

[7] *E.g.* Lev. xviii. 6, xix. 12 f., 18, 28.

3. (*a*) Even apart from the names by which the God of Israel is described, as it were, in reference to His personal essence, He reveals Himself as the possessor of a supra-mundane power that claims adoration, and to which man has to show obedience, humility, and reverence. The most general term for Deity in the Old Testament religion is Elohim.[1] The word appears in the plural; for the whole use of the singular, Eloah, shows it to be an artificial poetic form, and not the original form used by the people.[2]

We have already shown that this use of the plural undoubtedly points to the possibility of there being several gods—in other words, to the polytheistic idiom of the early Semites. But as an Old Testament name of God, the word, in spite of its plural form, whenever it refers to the God of Israel, is used solely of the One God, whose act, consequently, is described by the singular of the verb. It is, therefore, as was formerly shown, one of those plural forms by no means rare in the case of words denoting power and majesty,[3] which help to increase the significance of the word, and to express that fulness of power and majesty which is exclusively connected with unity of person. Probably the significance of the word does not depend directly on the idea of strength,[4] but on the notion of that which is terrible, majestic, adorable.[5]

In itself the word Elohim certainly has not a meaning exclusively applicable to the God of Israel. It is not a proper name of this God. The word may even denote a position among men of majesty and the highest authority. Thus

[1] אלהים.

[2] אלוה from earlier days only in Ps. xviii. 32, where, however, the other recension in 2 Sam. xxii. 32 has אל. This restricted use is decisive against von Hofmann's view that the sing. is the original form on the analogy of צחק, and means *σέβασμα*, the plural of which would therefore denote "terribleness."

[3] Cf. Ewald, *Gram.* § 178*b*. In reality, akin to the abstract formation חיים.

[4] אול (Ewald). Nöldeke connects אלהים and אל, and takes the root-meaning to be "Leader, Lord."

[5] אל, cf. Fleischer (in Delitzsch, *Comm. z. Gen.*, 4th ed. p. 47 f.) פחד, *σέβας*.

Moses is to become "Elohim" to Pharaoh,[1] and, according to the other narrative, to Aaron also;[2] that is, they are to see in him their master, to whom they must look up with deference, and from whom they have to take their orders. In like manner, it is polite to say, "I have seen thy face as one sees the face of Elohim," in other words, thou appearest to me honourable and honoured.[3] It is also an ancient idiom to call the magistrates Elohim, as possessing the highest power and authority — an idiom which may in some passages be disputed,[4] but which in a host of others cannot be explained away without the grossest straining of language,[5] and which, moreover, is still, it appears, in use among the Bedouin.[6] In like manner the *manes* of the dead are called Elohim.[7] In a solemn address the king of Israel is called Elohim.[8] But it is generally the gods of foreign nations that are thus designated. For they are likewise objects of adoration and worship. And all are called "sons of the gods"—beings belonging to the class of Elohim—who possess supernatural powers, and share that mode of Being which stands above the material and finite, above what is subordinate and lifeless.[9] Accordingly, when the God of Israel is called Elohim, He is thereby simply described as Deity, as possessor of a

[1] Ex. vii. 1 (A). [2] Ex. iv. 16 (C). [3] Gen. xxxiii. 10.

[4] Thus Ex. xii. 12 may be called doubtful, although the slaying of the first-born cannot be strictly called anything more than "an act of judgment on men"; so also Num. xxxiii. 4, and especially Lev. xix. 32, where, however, the "I am Jehovah" does not tell against the application to men.

[5] Judg. v. 8, "He chooses new magistrates." Also in 1 Sam. ii. 25, I have no doubt at all that magistrates must be meant. How any one can convince himself that the words in Ex. xxi. 5, 6, and xxii. 7 ff., mean an approach to *the Deity*, whose decision the priest is to communicate, passes my comprehension, especially when one compares ver. 27 (Ps. lviii. 2, lxxxii. 1, are, however, more doubtful).

[6] *Palgrave*, i. 83. [7] 1 Sam. xxviii. 13; cf. Isa. viii. 19.

[8] Ps. xlv. 7.

[9] In Gen. vi. 2, Ps. xxix., Job i. and ii., such beings are called בני־האלהים or בני אלים, in Gen. iii. 5, 22, Ps. viii. 6, they are called simply אלהים. Undoubtedly such a mode of speech points to a nature-religion being the original foundation.

nature which is absolutely sublime, and to which obedience and adoration are due from mortals. As a real proper name for Israel's God, the word is used only in very late times, when people thought of God as an abstraction, or were afraid, as in the second collection of Psalms, to pronounce the holy name of Jehovah.[1] All the time that the religion of Israel is at its best, the word occurs only as an appellative, or alternates with the holy personal name of God.

A word closely akin to Elohim is the divine name El,[2] in which God's strength and power are emphasised. Old proper names, perhaps, prove that this is the oldest Hebrew name for God, and it alternates with the more poetic "Zur" (Rock).[3] But, as in the case of Elohim, other gods can also be called El; and in proverbial sayings the word is applied to human relationships.[4]

[1] The procedure in A is naturally of quite a different character. He desires to show the growth of divine revelation. On the other hand in C the name Elohim is certainly used without any such intention; and unless there are here special circumstances in connection with the revision, this fact would necessarily limit the explanation given above.

[2] It still appears to me to be the simplest way to derive the word from אול (Ex. xv. 2, Ps. xxxvi. 7, lxxx. 11, xc. 2), and to give this root the meaning *to be strong* rather than *to be foremost*. It would be different, if it were necessary with de Lagarde (*Orientalia*, ii. 3, 9, *Mitth.* i. 94, ii. 27,) to regard this derivation from אול as untenable, because the shorter pronunciation would be the original, and the corresponding word-formations would, as neuter-passive participles, denote an involuntary condition, which ancient piety must have had scruples in applying to God. De Lagarde would therefore assign the word to the root אלי (cf. אל, prep. to), and see in it a description of God as "the One who is the goal of all human longing and all human endeavour." It would be useless to dispute as to the probability of such a name for God in primitive times (cf. Bæthgen, *Beiträge zur semitischen Religionsgeschichte*, 1888, 272 ff.). But if God is described as "The Strong," the question is not whether the condition thus assigned Him is voluntary or involuntary, but whether it is a merit or a defect. Words like כן and נר are sufficient to prove that such word-formations are quite admissible. The *tsere* in the plural and with the suffix is in favour of the derivation from אול (Ps. xlii. 10, LXX. *ἰσχυρός*).

[3] Zurishaddai, Pedahzur, Zuriel, Num. i. 6, 10, iii. 35 (Bab-ilu).

[4] Ex. xv. 11, xxxiv. 14, etc., of strange gods. In El Gibbor the word is used even of men (Isa. ix. 4, Ezek. xxxii. 21). The idiom in Gen. xxxi. 29, Micah ii. 1; cf. Deut. xxviii. 32, יש לאל ידם, is, on the analogy of the last passage, to be translated "it is in the power of their hand," not "their hand is as God"; cf. Hab. i. 11.

Even the name Adonai[1] simply asserts what God is as Deity, without describing Him as the one God of Israel. Originally, perhaps, the word, which also alternates with the simple הָאָדוֹן, or with more precise definitions, such as אֲדֹנֵי הָאֲדֹנִים or אֲדוֹן כָּל־הָאָרֶץ,[2] had the plural suffix of the first person added to it. In address this suffix still retains its meaning;[3] but in all other cases it is quite otiose. Adonai describes God as the Master to whom man stands in the relation of servant.[4] The word Baal, though subsequently repudiated, was probably used along with it even in Israel;[5] and old poetic expressions, like Abhir,[6] the strong, completed the circle of these divine names. In all of them God is revealed simply by His mighty power, which is far above what is earthly, human, and transient, and to which obedience and reverence are due; in other words, as the absolute Master of nature. All these words were used in the heyday of Israel's religion, especially in poetic diction. Thus we find in Job the singular Eloah,[7] as elsewhere Adonai,[8] Ha-adon,[9] the mighty One of Jacob,[10] the Rock of Israel,[11] the King.[12]

(*b*) Now in order to distinguish this mighty Being from those who are also called Elohim, a name might be given to Him indicating either that he was the highest in position, or—what is more in accordance with the essence of Israel's religion—that he had a special claim on the adoration of Israel. In the former case God is called El-elyon.[13] For

[1] אדני (the distinguishing Qamets), Ps. xvi. 2, xxxv. 23 (Gen. xv. 2, xx. 4).

[2] האדון, Ex. xxiii. 17; אדון כל־הארץ, Josh. iii. 13; Deut. x. 17.

[3] Gen. xv. 2, 8, xviii. 3, 27, 30, xx. 4. [4] Gen. xviii. 27.

[5] Cf. *e.g.* 2 Sam. v. 20, where the name Baal Perazim (=breaches made by Baal) is given because of the discomfiture of the enemy by *the God of Israel*. The repudiation of it appears to begin with Hosea ii. 1, 8.

[6] אביר, Gen. xlix. 24.

[7] Job iii. 4, vi. 4, 8, 9, ix. 13, xi. 5 f., xii. 4, 6, xv. 8, xvi. 20, etc. (Deut. xxxii. 15, 17; Prov. xxx. 5).

[8] Isa. vi. 1, xxi. 16, xxix. 13. [9] Isa. x. 16, 33, xix. 4.

[10] Isa. i. 24; B. J. xlix. 26, lx. 16 (Isa. xxxiii. 21, אדיר).

[11] Isa. xxx. 29. [12] Isa. vi. 5; B. J. xli. 21, xliii. 15, xliv. 6.

[13] אל עליון (connected with עלה), Ps. vii. 18; Deut. xxvi. 19.

although this divine name also appears among other peoples of Semitic speech[1] as the title of their chief God, still when used of the God worshipped in Israel, it is undoubtedly meant to describe Him as the first, ruling as *optimus maximus* over all other conceivable Elohim. The same intention is manifest in the name El Shaddai which, according to A, should be considered the only one in use in patriarchal times.[2] This word is meant to denote God as the absolutely mighty whom no other can withstand, so that His followers may fearlessly and confidently trust in Him, may build their faith upon Him. Such words may naturally occur even in polytheistic religions, as is proved by the Phœnician Eliun, the Syrian Azîz, and in fact by the familiar titles Jupiter Optimus Maximus, and Father Zeus. But in such religions they constitute the element that points toward monotheism. To this same category belongs the beautiful and significant expression "the living God,"[3] which distinguishes God from the products of art and nature as the self-governing Lord of life.

More important and more in accordance with the rise of Old Testament monotheism is the second method of connoting God by which He is defined as *God of this people*—that is, as the God connected with this portion of mankind by religious worship. Thus God is called the God of the fathers,[4] the God of Shem,[5] the God of the Hebrews,[6] the

[1] Gen. xiv. 18; the God of Melchizedek. Adonai also occurs as Adonis. According to Sanchuniathon in Eusebius, *Præpar. Evang.* i. 10, 36, the Phœnician Baal was called Eliun. (So also the Alonim valoniuth in Plautus, *Pœnulus* v. 1; cf. Hitzig, *Rheinisches Museum für Philol.* x. 76 ff.).

[2] אל שדי connected with שדד adjectival formation, Ew. § 155*c*. In A cf. Gen. xvii. 1 f., xxviii. 3, xxxv. 11, xliii. 14, xlviii. 3; Ex. vi. 3 ff. (in early poetry, Gen. xlix. 25). In the book of Ruth i. 20, in Job xxiv. 1, xxvii. 2, xxix. 25, xxxi. 31, xxxii. 8, xxxiv. 11, xl. 2, and Ps. lxviii. 15, the name is used as purely poetical. (The reading שַׁדַּי is very improbable).

[3] Josh. iii. 10; 1 Sam. xvii. 26, 36; Deut. v. 23; 2 Kings xix. 4, 16; cf. Ps. xxxvi. 10, xlii. 3, 9, lxxiv. 3; Jer. ii. 13, x. 10, xvii. 12, xxiii. 36.

[4] *E.g.* Gen. xxiv. 12, 27, xxvi. 24, xxviii. 13, xxxi. 42, xxxii. 10, xlvi. 1, 3, xlviii. 15, xlix. 24; Ex. iii. 6, 13, 15, 16, iv. 5, xv. 2, by all the narrators.

[5] Gen. ix. 26 (B). [6] Ex. iii. 18, v. 3, vii. 16, ix. 1, 13, x. 3 (C).

God of Bethel,[1] the God of vision,[2] the Fear of Isaac,[3] the Shepherd and Rock of Israel,[4] and, above all, the God of Israel.[5] The divine name which is found in all parts of the book of Isaiah, and occasionally also elsewhere, viz. "the Holy One of Israel," is worthy of special mention.[6] As the whole context shows, this title is evidently intended to denote, not the moral character of God, but only His majesty as adored in Israel. The main idea unquestionably is, that this God belongs to the people of Israel as the object of their worship. But the word chosen is also meant to express the incomparable majesty of the God whom Israel serves, a majesty constraining to fear and devotion. In the same way also God is called "the Holy One."[7]

(*c*) All the time the religion of Israel was in full vigour the personal name of the covenant God was the sacred Tetragram יהוה. The history of the pronunciation of this word is singularly obscure. A glance suffices to show that the vowels of the present Massorah are not intended to give its pronunciation, but to indicate that the word Adonai is to be read instead of it; for these vowels are replaced by those of the word Elohim wherever Adonai itself occurs in the consonantal text.[8] The name "Jahve" was regarded by the later age as a "secret" name of miraculous virtue, and as

[1] Gen. xxxi. 13 (B).

[2] Gen. xvi. 13; cf. xxiv. 62, xxv. 11. Certainly the meaning is obscure; רֹאִי may well be a word like עֲנִי in the sense of "vision." Perhaps the original meaning of the whole name has no connection at all with the name of God.

[3] Gen. xxxi. 42, 53 (C).

[4] Gen. xlix. 24, in old poetic phraseology (probably the Shepherd, the Rock of Israel, not the keeper of the Rock of Israel, *i.e.* of the Israelitish sanctuary?)

[5] *E.g.* Gen. xxxiii. 20.

[6] קְדוֹשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל, Isa. i. 4, v. 24 (19 used in mocking mimicry), x. 17, 20, xii. 6, xvii. 7, xxix. 19, 23, xxx. 11, 12, 15, xxxi. 1, xxxvii. 23; B. J. xli. 16, 20, xlv. 11, xlvii. 4, xlviii. 17, xlix. 7, liv. 5, lv. 5, xliii. 3, 14; 2 Kings xix. 22; Jer. l. 29, li. 5; Ps. lxxviii. 41, lxxxix. 19.

[7] B. J. xl. 25; Ps. xxii. 4; cf. Isa. v. 16; 1 Sam. vi. 20; cf. Jer. x. 10, xxiii. 36; 2 Kings xix. 4, 16; Ps. xlii. 3, 9, lxxxiv. 3 (אֵל חַי).

[8] *E.g.* Gen. xv. 2; Deut. iii. 24, ix. 26, etc.

too holy to be pronounced. Hence Qoheleth already avoids it, and the editor of the second collection of Psalms changes it regularly into Elohim, even when his doing so involves a mutilation of these Psalms.[1] In like manner, while the LXX. let the name Sabaoth stand as a proper name, *Σαβαώθ*, they invariably translate this strictly proper name by the less sacred word *κύριος*. The growth of this awe, based perhaps on Lev. xxiv. 11, 16,[2] can still be traced in the old Rabbinic literature.[3] Prior to the Exile, however, the word was a special favourite, and was used with religious pride; while the other names of God appeared as mere additions to it, or alternated with it according to the law of parallelism. In the later books it is repeated in a highly euphonious and emphatic way,[4] and in combinations which were unknown to the earlier ages;[5] and it is very frequently used to denote the *special differentiating attribute of the true God.*[6] In fact, it is a name which has suggested many a pleasing and significant play upon words. With the meaning assigned to the word since the time of C, viz. "He who is," are connected such expressions as "I am He," "I am the first and I also am the last."[7]

Even tradition throws little light on the original pronunciation. According to Diodorus Siculus and Origen, the proper pronunciation would be *Ἰαῶ* or *Ἰαή*; according to

[1] Ps. xlii.–lxxxiii. Psalms which occur both in the first and in the second book are, in the first case, Jehovistic, in the second, Elohistic. Expressions like אלהים אלהיך occur, *e.g.* Ps. xlv. 8. This phenomenon is of special importance for the explanation of the word Elohim in ver. 7.

[2] The LXX. already translate נקב by *ὀνομάζειν* (cf. Num. i. 17).

[3] Cf. in Schrader and Baudissin the growth of it according to Joseph. *Ant.* xii. 5. 5, ii. 12. 4. Philo, *De nom. mut.* § 2, *Vita Mos.* iii. 25, *Mishna* ix. 5, etc.

[4] יה יהוה, B. J. xxvi. 4.

[5] אדני יהוה, Ezek. xxiii. 32, xxiv. 14, 24, xxv. 14, xxvi. 14, 24, xxviii. 2, xxxi. 18.

[6] Ezek. xxv. 5, 7, 11, 17, xxvi. 6, xxviii. 22, 23, 26, xxix. 9, 16, 21, xxx. 8, 12, 19, 25, 26, xxxii. 15.

[7] אני הוא, B. J. xli. 4, xliii. 10, 13, 25, xlviii. 12, lii. 6; Deut. xxxii. 39. ראשון ואחרון, B. J. xliii. 10, 13, xliv. 6, xlviii. 12; Ps. cii. 28.

Jerome, Jaho; according to Philo Biblius, *Ἰευώ*; according to Clemens Alexandrinus, *Ἰαοὺ*. According to Theodoret, the Jews must have said *Ἀϊά*, and the Samaritans *Ἰαβέ*; the latter statement is also made by Epiphanius. Now since Jao is probably = Jahu, a form which Jews were at liberty to communicate to a non-Jew, and *Ἀϊά* is probably just יה with a prosthetic vowel, we have left as the real traditional form *Ἰαή Ἰαβέ* = יְהוָה which the Samaritans had no reason to keep secret. And besides, on linguistic grounds, if the word is of old-Hebrew origin at all, Jahve must be considered the only form which explains the contractions Jahu, Jeho, Jah, Jo.

Supposing we take this for granted, the next question is, what is the root meaning of the word? Here the explanation in Ex. iii. 14 may be at once set aside, because of the fondness which the writer C invariably shows for etymologies that certainly cannot be supported on linguistic grounds. It merely states the religious meaning which C wished to put into the name. According to Hebrew etymology the word must undoubtedly be connected with Hajah in its older form Havah, which, in later times, occurs only in the cognate dialects.[1] To this word which, in its later signification, denotes "being," Ewald assigns an earlier and fuller meaning "to be high." Consequently he would give to Jahve the original signification of "high, heavenly," which would practically correspond with the Aryan name for God in its root "div." The formation of the word would then be connected with the Qal on the analogy of Jizhaq, Ja'qob, etc.[2] Ewald thinks he is able still to find traces, in the Old Testament itself, of this word having the meaning "Heaven."[3] The passages he cites for this are, at all events,

[1] Schrader is right in pointing to Chavvah (Gen. iii. 20; cf. Gen. xxvii. 29; Isa. xvi. 4).

[2] Ew. *Gram.* § 162*a*. (cf. on div, etc., Welcker, *l.c.*, i. 130 ff.).

[3] Gen. xix. 24; Micah v. 6 (He connects it with هوا, הוד هود, etc.).

far too late to justify such inferences. The derivation itself is possible; but it remains a very doubtful one. For the Qal form the meaning "the living One" (Wellhausen), would certainly be more natural. But the view of Schrader and Lagarde appears to me still more suitable. On account of the E sound in the last syllable, and the imperfect A sound in the first syllable, they would refer it to a secondary conjugation and take the Hiphil as the original form. Then Jahve would be "he who causes to be" the Creator;[1] or if the signification "being" is only the weakened form of the stronger "living," then "the bestower of life." Besides it seems to me more probable that an ancient people would have called its God "the bestower of life," than "the existing One," "the living One." But even this view cannot be termed certain. Delitzsch is decidedly right in maintaining that the linguistic reasons against deriving the word from the Qal are not conclusive; and it is certainly an objection that the root היה has nowhere a Hiphil form, but expresses the causative by the Piel.[2] And although the reference to Aryan divine names, or to the Egyptian formula for God "I am I" goes for little in explanation of an old Semitic name of God, on account of the spirit of the Aryan nature-religion being so entirely different, and on account of the philosophical character of the doctrine taught by the Egyptian priesthood, still it will never be possible to prove that God could not have been described by ancient Israel as He whose essence is "self-subsistent or absolute Being."

Indeed even the opinion that the word may have been adopted from a larger linguistic family, in which case, certainly, its pronunciation would be quite undiscoverable, cannot be directly refuted. We cannot, it is true, make any use of the resemblances to non-Israelitish groups of religions

[1] Cf. also Movers, *Phönicier*, i. 159. Stade, p. 429, wishes to get out of the Hiphil the meaning "Feller, Destroyer."

[2] Yet cf. Nestle for the Syrian idiom.

which we have got handed down to us from an uncritical age that was prone to confuse all religions. The Gnostic name of God, Jao, is simply taken from reminiscences of the Old Testament;[1] the mention, by Diodorus, of the name Jao[2] an the breastplate of Egyptian priests and the tradition given by Demetrius Phalereus of the seven Greek vowels that formed the secret name of the god of the Egyptian priests (*ΙΕΗΟΩΤΑ*) are utterly worthless. The connection with *Jovis* is false, for the Aryan root *div* is the ground form of this word. But, although the reference to the Indian Âhu or to the surname of Adonis יְהוֹ be not considered worthy of attention, and the similarity in sound to the Assyrian god Ja, Ea, Hu, be disregarded, it is still a remarkable fact that in the cuneiform inscriptions there is a king of Hamath called Ja-ubidi, and a king of Damascus called Jâlu; and that in the Phœnician names, *Ἀβδαιος*, *Βιθυας*, this divine name is still heard in the Greek form, to say nothing of the Ammonite Tobijah.[3] It is certainly possible, according to the mode of thought characteristic of ancient polytheism, that in these cases the God of Israel is simply represented as being worshipped by individuals belonging to other kindred peoples. But it is also possible that this name belonged to a wider circle of Semitic peoples, and that only in Israel did it attain to pre-eminent religious significance.[4] It is, in fact, still the opinion of Land, as it formerly was of Hartmann, von Alm, von Bohlen, and Colenso, that the name is of North-Semitic, *i.e.* Canaanitish, origin, and indicates the God of Heaven as the Giver of fruitfulness, in whose honour the orgiastic worship of Syria was held. He supports this view by the oracle of Apollo of Clarus, which has been preserved by Macrobius, in which the word *Ιαω* is applied to Dionysius. Land, therefore, holds that this divine

[1] On these cf. the thoroughly conclusive disquisition of Baudissin, 218 ff.

[2] Diodorus, i. 94, takes it for granted that the name of the *Israelitish God* was, at that time, well known to the heathen.

[3] Neh. ii. 10.

[4] When, on the other hand, Lydus, *De Mens.* iv. 38, 14, speaks of Jao as a god of the Chaldeans, he probably confounds them with the Israelites.

name was appropriated by Israel along with the sacred ark, and that it became the recognised property of the people from the time of David onwards, whereas the ancient God, to whom the sacred stones at Gilgal were dedicated, was called El, Baal. But even though the passages referred to were of less doubtful authenticity, and of more certain age than they are, still Land's hypothesis would be conclusively disproved by the fact that since the earliest days—as, for instance, in the song of Deborah,—Jehovah is found as the God of Israel fighting against the Canaanites, but never appears as the God of the Syrian Semites against Israel. Nevertheless, so long as such theories continue to crop up, the question cannot be regarded as completely settled. Hence all we can say is that the divine name Jahve is probably of Hebrew origin, is in that case to be read Jahve, and understood either as "the original Source of real being," or more probably as "the Giver of life," both in the natural and the moral sense.

But how did the word come to mean the covenant God of Israel? The theory of A is that Moses was the first to introduce this name. When A says,[1] by way of giving final confirmation to his ordinary method of interpreting history, "God spake to Moses and said unto him, I am Jahve; and I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, as El Shaddai, but by my name Jahve I was not known to them," no unprejudiced person can doubt that this is meant to be a record of the first revelation of God as Jahve. If the meaning of these words were, "The name was well-known, but they did not yet know the depth of its meaning as explained in Ex. iii. 14," one might well ask how a name could be known without its real meaning being also known, since every revelation of a divine name is just *the unveiling of a new side of the divine character*. It would be impossible, in that case, to understand why A so persistently avoids using this name all through the patriarchal age, and why its meaning is not at

[1] Ex. vi. 2 ff.

least explained now; for Ex. iii. 14 is not taken for granted by A. But it certainly follows from these facts that the writer A intended, in accordance with the whole plan of his work, to show how the God Elohim became the God El Shaddai, and how, through Moses, the latter became Jahve, the covenant God of Israel. This narrative of A's has no historical value. The older narrators either use, like B, the name Jahve even for the pre-Mosaic age, or, like C, they use the name Elohim also for the post-Mosaic. Certainly the mention by A of the name Jochebed for the mother of Moses, and the enumeration in Chronicles[1] of several pre-Mosaic proper names formed from יהוה, cannot prove that this divine name was actually in use before the time of Moses, any more than does the mode of language adopted by B[2] and C. But it is in itself more likely that such a name was not *invented* but simply *found* by Moses. We may, therefore, infer that just as before Mahomet the name Allah was by no means unusual among His people, although put into the shade by the individual deities, so in Israel also this name must have been an ancient name of God, but that it now obtained quite a new significance as the name of the one national God, the covenant God of Israel. For that Jehovah was the God of Israel, from the bondage in Egypt onwards, is a very old tradition.[3]

It is certain that, since the time of Moses, the name Jahve is the proper name of the covenant God of Israel. It describes this God as the absolutely exalted, incomparable personal Being who, as Creator, is distinct from and above nature, and in whom one may trust, without anxiety or fear, for defence against all the powers of the world. Thus the declaration "I am Jehovah" and the threat "The enemy shall know that I am Jehovah" are old forms of speech in Israel.[4] But this word

[1] Ex. vi. 20; Num. xxvi. 59; cf. 1 Chron. ii. 24, vii. 3, 8.

[2] Even B intentionally, and in remarkable agreement with Sanchuniathon, makes the worship of Jahve begin not with Adam but with Enosh.

[3] Amos ii. 10, iii. 1; Hos. xii. 10, xiii. 4.

[4] Ex. vii. 17, viii. 6, 18, ix. 14, 29, xiv. 4, 18.

receives its enduring and most pregnant meaning in C, where, perhaps not strictly in accordance with the laws of language but in a creative fashion full of the deepest significance, the name is interpreted to mean "Being." Whether the writer himself created this signification or merely gave a literary dress to a meaning long in vogue, it is, of course, impossible for us to determine.

The passage in question[1] runs as follows: "And God said unto Moses, I Am that I Am; and He said, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I Am that I Am hath sent me unto you." Here it is by no means mere eternity of being that is predicated of God, or, as the later Alexandrine philosophy put it, the abstract idea of substance, τὸ ὄντως ὄν. It implies something personal and moral. God is a personal Being possessed of independent will, under no foreign influence, and consequently unchangeable, absolutely true to Himself, and to His own Being. Whoever has God, has on His side not merely irresistible power but also the trustworthy, faithful God, whose will, once revealed, can no longer be limited and changed from without. It is by this declaration that the highest conception of God in the Old Testament religion is first revealed. Till God unveils Himself in the New Testament, as the Father of the Son, nothing higher is said of Him than that He is Jahve in the above sense of that word.

Since the time of Hosea, it is true, the term "Father," as applied to God, is often found in the prophets. But it either describes God's special love to Israel, and, in that case, is not so much a name of God as a description of His covenant-fellowship with His people. In this sense, the term is the foundation of the doctrine of Jesus regarding God as His Father. Or else, where the word occurs without any such nearer limitation,[2] it refers to God solely as the great First Cause and the supreme Ruler, so that nothing more is implied

[1] Ex. iii. 14. [2] Jer. ii. 27, iii. 4; Mal. i. 6.

than in the term "Lord." Consequently, as a real divine name, this word does not take us beyond the ordinary Old Testament doctrine of God.

The name Jahve is the personal name of the covenant God of Sinai. Hence it is self-evident that this name can be applied to no other God. But it is quite proper to join other names to it, in order to express the dignity of this Jehovah. Hence He is called Jehovah the God of Israel, the Everlasting God, thy God, etc. The singular combination Jahve Elohim, which is probably due to the hand of the final redactor in the chapters connecting A and B,[1] expresses in a rather doctrinaire fashion, the idea that the covenant God of Israel is none other than the God of the world.

(*d*) In the earlier poetry and heroic history, the title "God of hosts"[2] is of very frequent occurrence. It is found in various forms, more or less exact; its complete form is "Jehovah, God of hosts."[3] The derivation of the phrase may appear doubtful, in consequence of the ambiguity of the word "hosts." The word is undoubtedly used at first of the hosts of Israel, which, as such, are the hosts of God.[4] And many expressions, especially in poetry, which describe God as He marches to war in defence of Israel, mustering His host and summoning His men of might, may refer to this

[1] Gen. ii. 4*b*–iv.

[2] Cf. Oehler (2nd ed. Kautzsch) in Herzog, art. "Zebaoth."

[3] יהוה צבאות, sometimes inaccurately יהוה אלהי־צבאות, in the LXX. as a proper name Σαβαωθ; cf. 1 Sam. i. 3, iv. 4; Isa. i. 24, v. 24, vi. 3, 5, viii. 13, 18, ix. 12, xiv. 27, xvii. 3, xviii. 7, xix. 4, 12, 16, 18, 20, xxii. 12, xxix. 6, xxxi. 4 f., xxxvii. 16, 32, xxxix. 5; B. J. xiii. 4, xxiii. 9, xlvii. 4, xlviii. 2, li. 15, liv. 5; Jer. ii. 19, vi. 6, 9, vii. 21, ix. 6, x. 16, xi. 17, 20, 22, xv. 16, xix. 3, 11, 15, xx. 12, xxiii. 15, 16, 36, xxv. 8, 27 f.; Hos. xii. 6; Micah iv. 4; Zeph. ii. 9 f.; specially complete Amos iii. 13, v. 14 ff., 27. In Haggai and Zechariah they are artistically massed together. The form אדני צבאות occurs in Isa. x. 16. The form אלהים צבאות is, of course, only an absurd editorial alteration in the second collection of Psalms for יהוה צבאות. Ps. lix. 6, lxxx. 5, 8, 15 (still cf. Ps. lxxx. 20, יהוה אלהים צבאות).

[4] *E.g.* Ex. xii. 17, 41, 51, vii. 4; Num. i. 3, 20, ii. 3, 9, 18, x. 14; Deut. xx. 9; Ps. lxviii. 13; 1 Kings ii. 5; Deut. xx. 9, שׂרי צבאות.

meaning.[1] But the stars are also called the host of God, the army of heaven which God has created and which obey His call.[2] This army is represented as used by God for the purposes of His kingdom; and it might very well be deemed expedient, in view of the idolatrous worship of this "army of heaven," to describe Him as the God whom this very host has to obey.[3] Lastly, the angelic hosts are represented as the hosts of God. These are thought of as a well-appointed army, with princes and leaders;[4] and in the more exalted diction of poetry they are often, in accordance with the ancient idea, confounded with the army of heaven.[5] And as "chariots and horses of fire" encircle those whom God loves,[6] He might very well be called the Captain of these heavenly hosts. Thus, apparently, the phrase may have three distinct meanings,—the God of the armies of Israel, the God of the starry host, the God of the angelic throng.

From the periods in which these expressions are used, no certain conclusion can be drawn. At the most, we may infer that an original reference to the starry host and the worship paid to it, is improbable. The expression is old; and evidently the worship of the host of heaven in Israel and the neighbouring peoples is a result of Assyrian and Babylonian influences. Consequently, if there is any reference to the stars, it can only be in the second instance, after these got into the ranks of the Elohim. On the other hand, the earthly and the heavenly hosts[7] of Jehovah have an equal claim to

[1] So 1 Sam. xvii. 45; Ps. xxiv. 8, the God of the armies of Israel, Jehovah mighty in battle; Ps. xliv. 10, lx. 12, Thou goest not forth with our hosts; B. J. xiii. 4, the Lord of hosts mustereth the host for the battle; cf. Ps. cviii. 12.

[2] Deut. iv. 19 (Job xxxviii. 7); Jer. xix. 13, xxxiii. 22; B. J. xxxiv. 4, xl. 26 (Gen. ii. 1; Neh. ix. 6; Ps. xxxiii. 6).

[3] In addition to the passages quoted, cf. for the worship of the host of heaven, 2 Kings xvii. 16, xxi. 3, 5, xxiii. 4 f. For the stars fighting, Judg. v. 20.

[4] 1 Kings xxii. 19; Josh. v. 14; Ps. ciii. 21, cxlviii. 2, they are the host of heaven; cf. Ps. lxxxix. 8, lxviii. 18.

[5] Job xxxviii. 7.

[6] 2 Kings vi. 17.

[7] The stars are the host of Jehovah (Gen. i.–ii. etc.). Of course, in that case, we must in Ps. ciii. 21, cxlviii. 2, either read צבאו, or suppose a later plural צבאים.

consideration. But, in view of a whole array of parallel passages that force themselves irresistibly on our notice, it cannot be doubted that the hosts of Israel were regarded as the armies of this God.[1] While Israel was carrying on the wars of Jehovah with courage and success, it saw in its God also its Commander-in-chief, to whose help the people trooped at the call to arms, and who went forth Himself with the armies of His people.[2]

But the emphasis with which the name is used to assert the majesty of God, and the use of the word Sabaoth[3] in the absolute, make it probable that the pious did not think, in the first instance, of earthly hosts when they described God as the Lord of hosts. The eye of believing Israel saw God surrounded with His heavenly hosts, with chariots of fire and horses of fire, whose warrior princes are angels of the highest rank. When this people was prosecuting its wars, it saw in its God the heavenly Helper who, by the might of His heavenly hosts, assured His followers of victory. To the eye of faith, the hosts of heaven and earth formed but a single army. Thus the name may well have referred originally to the hosts of heaven.[4] And this agrees also with the fact that it is particularly common when the majesty of Jehovah has to be asserted as against other gods.[5]

[1] 1 Sam. xvii. 45, xviii. 17, xxv. 28; Judg. v. 23. "God of the armies of Israel," "the wars of Jehovah." In Jer. xxxii. 18, "the Lord of Hosts" is synonymous with "Hero."

[2] Since the name appears very frequently along with the ark of God, it might be connected with the originally warlike character of this sanctuary.

[3] Never צבאות ישראל.

[4] Ps. lxxxix. 6.–10; Isa. xxxi. 4 (Wellhausen, Judg. v. 20; 1 Kings xx. 19; Nahum i. 14).

[5] Amos iii. 13 ff., iv. 13, vi. 8, 14, ix. 5; Isa. ii. 12, etc.

CHAPTER IX.

THE BEING AND ATTRIBUTES OF GOD.

LITERATURE.—Diestel, "Die Heiligkeit Gottes" (*Jahrbb. für deutsche Theologie*), 1859, iv. 1, 1 ff. "Die Idee der Gerechtigkeit im *A. T.* (*l.c.*, v. 2, 176 ff., 1860). Alb. Ritschl, *De ira Dei*, Bonn 1859, 8–15. F. Weber, *Vom Zorn Gottes ein biblisch theologischer Versuch*, 1862. Bartholomæi, "Vom Zorn Gottes" (*Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol.* 1861, vi. 2). Achelis, "Versuch die Bedeutung des Wortes קדש aus der Geschichte der göttlichen Offenbarung zu bestimmen" (*Theol. Stud. u. Krit.* 1847, i. 187 ff.). J. Matth. Rupprecht, "Ueber den Begriff der Heiligkeit Gottes" (*Theol. Stud. u. Krit.* 1849, iii. 684). Caspari, "Ueber das Wort קְדֹשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל, cf. jesajanische Studien" (*Zeitschrift für luther. Theol. und Kirche*, 1844, iii. p. 92 ff.). Achelis, "Ueber den Schwur Gottes bei sich selbst" (*Theol. Stud. u. Krit.* 1867, iii.). Menken, "Versuch einer Anleitung zum eignen Unterricht in den Wahrheiten der Schrift," 3rd ed. 1833, p. 58 ff. (*Ges. Schr.* vi. 46 ff.). Baudissin, *Studien zur semitischen Religionsgeschichte*, 1878, Part 2 *Heiligkeit Gottes.* Oehler (2nd ed. Delitzsch), *Realencycl.* art. "Heiligkeit Gottes."

1. God stands first of all in the category of Elohim. He is Deity; He is the strong and mighty One, the possessor, therefore, of a nature of such majesty and power as to raise Him above the world of sense and its limitations. This conception of God, if carried to its full logical conclusion according to our way of thinking, must free Him from all limitations of a material existence in space and time, not only in His being—that is, as *eternal* and *omnipresent*, but likewise in His knowing as *omniscient*, and in His willing as *omnipotent.* But this religion, especially in the earlier ages, is very far from being thus logical. Its only religious interest is to conceive of God when helping His own as mightier than His

opponents, and as not impeded in His work by time and space. Otherwise it never hesitates to conceive and describe divine action as limited, like human action, both by time and space. And although after the eighth century ancient legend is no longer found in its full *naïveté*, the Scribes who succeed Ezra are really the first to find anything objectionable in such ideas. Of course, even legend never speaks of God's existence having either beginning or end. But when God repents[1] of what He had formerly done, time is predicated of Him as a change in His inner life. And when He is represented as "walking in the garden," when Cain flees from His presence when He descends from heaven and walks with Abraham when Jacob is astonished that God is also in Bethel, and so on it becomes clear that God is not conceived of as omnipresent in the dogmatic sense.[2] In the same way, it is certain that the popular conception of God's presence as a gracious and self-revealing God was very often confounded with an actual localising of the divine presence. To die outside Canaan is "to have one's blood fall to the earth far away from the presence of Jehovah";[3] and evidently the sacred ark, with its magical and fatal effects, is many a time directly identified with the divine presence.[4]

It is in accordance with this view that God's knowledge is not represented as infinite, or His power as boundless. God's question to Adam might,[5] perhaps, be explained as merely the voice of conscience; and to refresh God's memory by the blowing of trumpets on feast-days[6] is no more a repudiation of omniscience than prayer is. But there is an incongruity between God's omniscience and His requiring to convince Himself, by personal inquiry, of the truth of a rumour;[7] and also between

[1] Gen. vi. 6. [2] Gen. iii. 8, iv. 14, 16, xviii. 21 ff., xxviii. 16 f.

[3] 1 Sam. xxvi. 20 (2 Kings v. 17). The "face of God" is certainly the usual expression for His revealing presence.

[4] 1 Sam. iv. 3–22, v. 3–vi. 19. When the sacred tent is pitched outside the camp, Jehovah is not in the midst of His people (Ex. xxxiii. 7).

[5] Gen. iii. 9. [6] Gen. iii. 9; Num. x. 9. [7] Gen. xi. 5, xviii. 21.

His omnipotence and His being caused anxiety by the newly-acquired knowledge and the concerted action of men.[1] The pious were not searching after the idea of the absolute, but after that of the efficient working of the divine personality. Their only concern was to make sure of this, as the foundation of their religious loyalty to God, that His providence would be to them a real and effective protection. The idea, of which they kept a firm hold, was the personal freedom of God in regard to time, space, and every created thing, freedom which assures believers that, as the covenant God of His people, He is absolutely trustworthy, and unhampered by limitations.

In this sense God is transcendental. He is called Jehovah; He who will be what He will be—that is to say, He who, in regard to the future, is absolutely self-dependent, even as, in regard to the past, He is self-originating, and is therefore exposed to no alteration by the powers of the world and of time.[2] Sacrifice and prayer rise to Him from every quarter. His angels, that is, the forms in which He reveals Himself, find a man at any place[3] in the land of Chaldea, or in the privacy of the pathless desert. He is thought of as present at the covenant sworn to on the lonely plateau.[4] Hence, even in the old popular religion, God is most assuredly conceived of as omnipresent in the sense required by the necessities of religion, but not in the philosophical sense, and least of all in a pantheistic way. He is thought of as omnipresent in a way which quite readily admits of His being localised in heaven, His holy palace;[5] and which in nowise contradicts the view of the pious that He is specially connected with the places where His salvation has been revealed; with His

[1] Gen. iii. 22, xi. 7. [2] Ex. iii. 14.
[3] *E.g.* Gen. viii. 20, xii. 1, xvi. 7, xxiv. 12 f.; Judg. vii., xiii.
[4] Gen. xxxi. 50.
[5] Ps. xi. 4, xviii. 7 (ii. 4); 2 Sam. xxii. 7; cf. 1 Kings viii. 32, 36.

throne above the cherubim, the sacred ark, his holy hill, the land of His inheritance, and the garden of Eden.[1]

The wisdom of God is conceived of after the same fashion. It does not imply that He has no need of means whereby to acquire knowledge. On the contrary, as it is quite concretely put, "His eyes see everything." But still His knowledge is such that everything lies open before Him,—the present and the future, inner life and outward events, what is secret and what is done before witnesses. On this is based the primitive belief in soothsaying, prophesying, and the casting of lots. On this also rests the belief that Israel's history is under divine guidance. God knows beforehand what Abraham will do, and what will befall him; He knows that Pharaoh will harden his heart at the doings of God, and that Moses is capable of delivering His people.[2] God tries the heart and the reins.[3] He knows Sheol and Abaddon as well as the heart of man.[4] He knows thoughts, both good and bad;[5] weighs men's most secret deeds, and answers prayer.[6]

To this God of Israel faith looks up as to one whose power is unhampered by creature limitations. He is the God who works miracles, who can move at His will everything that exists, and call forth by His decree what is new. The creation of the earth and its inhabitants, the Deluge, the destruction of Sodom, the defeat of the Egyptians and the Canaanites, proclaim His power over nature and man;[7] they prove Him to be the Mighty One, who can throw into the sea the horse and his rider,[8] who killeth and maketh alive, who casteth down to Sheol and bringeth up,[9] whose highest prerogative it is to

[1] Josh. iv. 9, 18, vii. 6; 1 Sam. v. 3–vi. 19; 2 Sam. vi. 7–11; Ps. xv. 1, etc.
[2] *E.g.* Gen. xv. 13 ff.; Ex. iii. 2 ff., 19; iv. 14, vii. 3 ff., xi. 1 ff.
[3] Ps. vii. 10, xi. 4. [4] Prov. xv. 3, 11, xvi. 1, 2; cf. xvii. 3, xx. 12.
[5] Gen. vi. 5, 9, 13, vii. 1, iii. 11, iv. 6; 2 Sam. vii. 20, etc.
[6] *E.g.* Gen. xviii. 15, xxiv. 12 ff.; 1 Sam. ii. 3.
[7] Gen. ii., iii., vi., vii., xix.; Ex. xii.–xv.; Josh. i. ff.
[8] Ex. xv. 1, 3. [9] 1 Sam. ii. 6.

humble the lofty and exalt the lowly.[1] Nature celebrates God's power when, at His command, sun and stars fulfil their courses, and when His voice of thunder startles and awes every living thing into silence.[2] His hand is not too short to save; He who made the mouth can also cause to speak; as absolute Lord of the world He can give or withhold life.[3] It is this divine omnipotence that awakens in David heroic boldness.[4] In this is Israel's confidence; for "some trust in chariots and some in horses: but we will make mention of the name of Jehovah our God."[5] Belief in this omnipotence rings out clear in the names for God which the poets use, when they call Him the Strong, the Mighty, the Creator of heaven and earth.[6]

When the great prophets are spoken of in this connection as developing the idea of God, it must not be imagined that the expressions were in any way purified and perfected in a metaphysical sense. All that is meant is that the warmth of religious conviction as to the power of God over the world, and as to His own fulness of life, seems, if possible, to have become intensified. As it was of importance, in view of the charm possessed by the nature-religion of their cultured conquerors, to show the people what an inheritance they had in their God, the prophets naturally took the liveliest interest in picturing to them, when they were fearful and of little faith, how highly exalted that God was above the world, and above space and time. This holds specially true of the great exilic prophet, whose task it was to create Israel as it were anew, and to gather, out of the perishing people that succumbed to the religion of Babylon, the nucleus of a new people prepared to acknowledge the spiritual God.

Thus in the Psalms, and in the prophetic books after Amos,

[1] 1 Sam. ii. 4 ff.; Job v. 11.
[2] Ps. viii., xix., xxix.
[3] Gen. xxx. 2; Ex. iv. 11; Prov. xx. 12 (1 Sam. xiv. 6; 2 Kings v. 7).
[4] Ps. xviii.; 1 Sam. xiv. 6, xvii. 37, 45, 47.
[5] Ps. xx. 8.
[6] אל, שדי, אביר, בח, עז, חזק, and other expressions applied to God.

we find it frequently declared, and with ever-increasing emphasis, that God is eternal, independent of all the changes of time. Before the mountains were brought forth, or the earth and the world had been created, even from everlasting to everlasting He is God.[1] He is the same; the manner of His being, therefore, depends invariably on Himself.[2] He is the first and the last, whose days have no end. According to A, the first day, in other words, time itself, comes forth from the will of God. It is not said: "In the beginning was God," but "in the beginning when God created." Hence God is the self-evident pre-supposition of every beginning of which a created being can conceive.[3] Therefore, heaven and earth pass away. He endures,[4] and He endures as He is. He swears by His own eternity,[5] by Himself and His great name.[6] Hence He is the last, the most certain, on whom all being depends—the living God.[7] Thus He is called in poetry the everlasting God, who inhabiteth eternity, who calleth the æons from the beginning, the everlasting King.[8] For Him time has not the same meaning as for a created being: a thousand years in His sight are but as yesterday when it is past.[9] "Thus the idea searches after a suitable expression whereby to set God above all earthly time" (Lutz). But this everlastingness attains its proper religious significance in immutability, as it is said: He does not repent; He remains as He is.[10]

It is exactly the same in relation to space. True, it is

[1] Ps. xc. 2, cii. 27; Job xxxvi. 26; B. J. xl. 28.
[2] הוּא.
[3] Gen. i. 1, 5.
[4] Ps. cii. 27.
[5] Deut. xxxii. 40; Num. xiv. 21, 28.
[6] Jer. xxii. 5, xliv. 26, xlix. 13, li. 14 (Amos iv. 2, vi. 7 f., viii. 7); cf. B. J. lxii. 8.
[7] 2 Kings xix. 4, 16; Ps. xlii. 3, 9, lxxxiv. 3 f.; Josh. iii. 10 (Deut. v. 24, 26); 1 Sam. xvii. 26, 36; Jer. x. 10, xxiii. 36.
[8] B. J. xl. 28, lvii. 15, xli. 4; Jer. x. 10; cf. Dan. vii. 13, 22, "The Ancient of Days" and indefinite expressions like Ps. lv. 20, xciii. 2.
[9] Ps. xc. 4.
[10] Num. xxiii. 19; Ezek. xxiv. 14; Zech. viii. 14 f.; Mal. iii. 6; Lam. v. 19; cf. Ps. xc. 4, cii. 26–28; 1 Sam. xv. 29.

always taken for granted that God is specially present in the holy places, which He has consecrated as the points from which His gracious revelation started. He is still always called, in the language of poetry, "He who sitteth upon the cherubim."[1] It is in His holy city, in His temple, in the sacred ark, that He dwells;[2] and to be far away from these is "to go away from the face of God."[3] In the rustling of the trees, David hears the approach of God.[4] And as the eye, in its search for Him, is involuntarily lifted to the bright expanse of heaven, so the ordinary diction of poetry continues, down to the latest age, to speak of heaven as God's seat,[5] of His holy temple there,[6] the place from which He goeth forth.[7] He answereth from heaven and sendeth help from the sanctuary, from Zion.[8] He dwelleth in the heights, even in Zion.[9] And these expressions are by no means merely symbolical. But the godly of this age have long got beyond the idea of the divine action being conditioned by space. God's presence in Israel is the presence of revealing grace. When they sin and break the covenant, then there is no God in Zion; He dwells no longer among them. It would be fatal superstition to build upon God's presence, without having the disposition which alone makes that presence possible.[10] And although the temple is God's house, and though His eyes are open toward it night and day, He is not confined within its bounds. The temple is only the house where His name abides, where He will allow His eye and His heart to be.

[1] 2 Kings xix. 15; Isa. xxxvii. 16.

[2] Amos i. 2; Isa. viii. 18 (xii. 6), xxxi. 9; B. J. lx. 13; Ps. xxvi. 8, xlvi. 5, xlviii. 2, xiv. 7, xxvii. 4 f., cxxi. 1, etc.; Joel iv. 16, 21. (In Micah vii. 14, there is no mention of God dwelling in Carmel but of Israel feeding on its rich pastures; cf. Deut. xxxiii. 28); Num. xiv. 42 ff.

[3] B. J. xxvi. 17; cf. Hitzig. [4] 2 Sam. v. 24.

[5] *E.g.* Lam. iii. 50; Ps. xxxiii. 13 ff.

[6] Isa. vi. 1 ff.; Hab. ii. 20; B. J. lxiii. 15.

[7] Micah i. 3; Deut. xxvi. 15; B. J. xxvi. 21; Zech. ii. 13; Ps. xxxiii. 14.

[8] Ps. xx. 3; cf. 7. [9] Ps. lxviii. 17; cf. Isa. xxxiii. 14.

[10] Deut. i. 42; Jer. viii. 19; Ezek. xxxv. 10, xliii. 5, 7; cf. Micah iii. 11; Jer. iii. 16 f., vii. 4, 8, 14, xxvii. 17; B. J. xlviii. 2.

Heaven and earth cannot contain Him, how much less then a house.[1] Even the heaven where He dwells in His holy palace is not the atmospheric sky. This sky contains Him as little as does the earth. It is only, as it were, the throne, of which the footstool is the earth.[2] The presence of God pervades all space.[3] Prayer reaches Him from any quarter of the world, from Babylon as well as from Zion. He is at once a God at hand and a God afar off.[4] He has encompassed with His Spirit the universe as it came into being, and with His life-giving Word He has filled the immensity of space.[5] His glory fills the whole earth and the heavens too. But it is only in a late Psalm that we find a really philosophical view of this divine omnipresence.[6]

The God who rules time and space is a conscious personal Being. He is omniscient. Space and time do not limit His knowledge. Certainly it is only the Psalm just mentioned that depicts the omniscience as well as the omnipresence of God in a really instructive fashion. It describes how neither the ends of heaven nor the depths of Sheol, neither light nor darkness, can hide anything from God's knowledge, because even the night is light about Him. But the passages are all the more frequent, in which this conviction shows itself, in naïve individual expressions, which have sometimes quite a materialistic ring about them. All prophecy is, in fact, a proof of God's infinite knowledge. By it the prophet of the Exile proves that God knows the things that are to come before they spring forth;[7] and that while the idolaters

[1] 1 Kings viii. 27 ff. (31, 38, 44, 48, cf. 12 f.), ix. 3 (cf. Isa. xviii. 7; Deut. xii. 5, 12, xvi. 6, 11, 15).

[2] 1 Kings viii. 27 f.; B. J. lxvi. 1.

[3] Amos ix. 2 ff. (Ps. cxxxix. 7–10; 1 Kings viii. 27; His countenance, His Spirit, is everywhere).

[4] Amos ix. 2 ff.; Jer. xxiii. 24. [5] Gen. i.

[6] Ps. cxxxix. 2 ff. Here God's Spirit, that is, His living power, and His face, that is, His personal care of the world, are conceived of as the media of this omnipresence. (The Phœnicians personify Shem-Baal and Pne-Baal as goddesses.)

[7] B. J. xli. 22, 26, xlv. 14 ff., xlviii. 16.

are surprised by events, being unwarned of them, Israel, as the people of the God who governs the universe, knows all about them beforehand.[1] Time and space do not limit God's knowledge. Even the most hidden and secret things He knows, the depths of the heart, the sighs and sorrows of the breast, the evil designs of the wicked. He looks down from above on the bustling multitudes.[2] Before a man comes into being, God knows his character and his calling.[3] Man looks on the outward appearance, but God looks on the heart.[4] He that planted the ear, shall He not hear? He that formed the eye, shall He not see?[5] In short, God knows everything,[6] and knows it clearly and accurately.[7]

God's power, like His knowledge, is not limited by anything in the world. His word called the world into existence, so that it was good—that is, corresponded to His will.[8] He is the irresistible God from whom nothing can escape,[9] who formed the mountains and created the wind, who maketh the dawn darkness and treadeth upon the high places of the earth,[10] who killeth and maketh alive,[11] the God of might and power, the God who is to be feared.[12] He is the doer of wonders.[13] His word does not return to Him void, just as the snow and the rain do not return to heaven without making the earth bring forth and bud.[14] When man is fearful and of

[1] B. J. xli. 22 f., xlii. 9, xliii. 9–12, xliv. 7, 25, xlvi. 10.

[2] Ps. xxxiii. 13 ff. [3] Jer. i. 5.

[4] 1 Sam. xvi. 7; 1 Kings viii. 39; Ps. xxxviii. 10, xliv. 22 (Prov. xxi. 2, xxiv. 12).

[5] Ps. xciv. 9.

[6] Jer. xi. 20, xvii. 9 f., xvi. 17, xii. 3, xviii. 23, xx. 12, xxiii. 23 f., xxxii. 19, li. 15, 19; Ezek. xi. 5; Zech. ix. 1; Job xi. 11, xxvi. 3 ff., xxxiv. 21 ff.; Prov. v. 21; Ps. xxxiii. 15, etc.

[7] Hos. v. 3. [8] Gen. i. 31; Ps. xxxiii. 6. [9] Job xii. 14–21.

[10] Amos iv. 13, v. 8; Micah i. 3; Nahum i. 3 ff.; B. J. xl. 25, xlii. 5, xliv. 25, xlv. 12, 18, xlviii. 13, li. 13; Job xxvi. 5 ff.

[11] Deut. xxxii. 39; Hos. xiii. 14; B. J. lxvi. 9; Zech. xii. 1.

[12] Isa. i. 24, x. 23; Jer. xxxi. 17, 35, xxxii. 18, 27, xlix. 19, l. 44; Deut. vii. 21.

[13] Joel ii. 26; Jer. xxxii. 20; cf. v. 22, 24; Job v. 9 ff., ix. 4 ff., 10 ff., xxxvii. 14.

[14] B. J. lv. 10 f., lix. 1 (1 Sam. xiv. 6; Num. xi. 23).

little faith, this omnipotence of God is called to his remembrance, in order to shame and strengthen him. When he trusts to his own strength, this teaching bows him in the dust before the Almighty, to whom the heathen nations are as the small dust of a balance, as the drop of a bucket.[1] No wisdom, no understanding or counsel, avails aught against the Lord. His counsel, which is far above the thoughts of man, stands firm and sure. He does whatsoever He pleases;[2] and all success comes from Him alone.[3] While the idols can do neither good nor evil, He makes both good and evil, and creates darkness and light.[4] And this God of power is proclaimed alike by nature in her glory, which is His work,[5] and by the wonderful history of His people, in which He has proved Himself the Almighty, who turns to His own ends everything that happens in the world.[6]

2. This mighty God who rules the world is worthy of all confidence and love, and is the Source of whatever is good and upright. Israel holds that in Him are united all the moral qualities which should mark the character and conduct of a perfect and exemplary man. It is true, God is still naïvely regarded as liable to be affected by the same emotions as influence the soul of man. But it is always the religious aim of the writers to give a clear impression of God's perfect goodness, truth, and wisdom, and to extol these attributes. Hence it is of more importance to notice what is related of God than what is expressly taught regarding Him.

[1] Such passages as B. J. xl. 15–24, xliii. 13, xlv. 1, l. 2, li. 7 ff.; Zech. viii. 6; Ps. lxxiv. 16 ff., lxxxix. 9 ff.

[2] B. J. lv. 8 ff.; Ps. cxv. 3.

[3] Jer. xxxii. 19; B. J. xiv. 24, 27, xl. 29 ff.; Zech. x. 3 ff.

[4] B. J. xli. 23, xlv. 7, liv. 16; Amos iii. 6.

[5] Jer. v. 22, x. 10, 12, 16, xiv. 22, xxvii. 5; B. J. xl. 12, l. 2 f., li. 15; Job v. 9 ff., ix. 4 ff., xi. 7 ff., xxxiv. 13, xxxvi. 26–xxxvii. 14; Ps. xxiv. 1 ff., xxxiii. 13–17, civ.

[6] Deut. x. 21, xi. 3, xxvi. 8, xxix. 2, xxxii. 12 ff.; B. J. xiv. 27, li. 2, 9; Jer. x. 6 f., xxxi. 8; Ps. lxvi. 5 ff., lxxiv. 13 ff., lxxvii. 15–21, lxxviii. 4 ff., cxxxv. 8 ff.

The first attribute of moral perfection is righteousness,[1] that is, the moral exactitude with which God applies the standard (which He has within Himself) of perfect motives, without fear, partiality, or selfishness, wherever His revelation finds expression. The word צַדִּיק is, after all, not often applied to God.[2] Where it does occur, it describes God as the mighty Rock on which the moral order of the universe is founded, in which the pious may safely trust for defence against the mighty wicked;[3] that is, in the very way in which Ps. xvii. 2, and Prov. xv. 25, 29, xvii. 15, extol God as the foe of injustice and the answerer of the godly. Faith in God's righteousness the godly man must retain, in spite of all the apparent success of injustice.[4] It is the pledge that justice will triumph in the world;[5] and it realises the salvation of the godly.[6] Hence the "Zidqoth Jahve" are His deeds of righteousness as the covenant God, His acts of salvation.[7] And even in Ps. xxxvi. 7, the righteousness of God, which is "high as the mountains of God," is His saving power, in which the godly trusts and from which he expects help; and it is synonymous with God's "goodness."[8] Thus, in many a Psalm, where the righteousness of God is celebrated, it is combined with His "goodness," because he who is faithful to the covenant may hope for salvation equally from both.[9] There is never any antagonism between the goodness of God and His righteousness, which the Old Testament extols. But

[1] צדיק, צדקה. (The condition which corresponds with the normal rule.)

[2] In Ex. ix. 27, it means simply "to have right on one's side in a quarrel."

[3] Ps. vii. 10, 18 (ver. 12 is probably to be translated after ver. 9 as "doing justice to the righteous"), xi. 7, xviii. 21.

[4] Jer. xii. 1.

[5] Zeph. iii. 5; B. J. xlii. 21; Ps. cxix. 137, cxxix. 4.

[6] B. J. xlv. 21; Ps. lxix. 28, cxliii. 11.

[7] Judg. v. 11; Micah vi. 5; 1 Sam. xii. 7; B. J. xlv. 24; Ps. ciii. 6.

[8] Ver. 11; cf. Ps. v. 9, xlviii. 11, lxxi. 2, cxix. 40, 149, cxliii. 1, cxlv. 7.

[9] Hos. ii. 21; Ps. xxii. 32, xxxiii. 5, xxxv. 28, xl. 11, li. 16, lxxxix. 15, cxlv. 7 (Prov. xxii. 23; Ps. xxxi. 24, etc.). In Jer. ix. 24, righteousness and goodness stand in antithetic parallelism to wrath. It is interesting to compare B. J. xlv. 21 with Zech. ix. 9, צדיק ונושע, צדיק ומושיע.

God as the righteous One is of course also the Judge of the world, before whom wickedness meets its doom;[1] the God who sanctifies Himself by righteousness, and gives expression to His righteousness by punishment.[2]

Faith in God as the defender of the right lies at the root of Israel's whole conception of history. From the flood till the conquest of Canaan, God shows that He will not permit a breach of morality to pass unpunished; and He applies, through His omnipotence as judge, the standard of His revealed will wherever it is not inwardly realised. Thus He is "the avenger of blood,"[3] who does not allow a guilty man to pass unpunished.[4] Hence, God's will is indissolubly linked with the great statutes of justice and morality. Because He is Israel's God, that people must not warp and violate justice.[5] In the ten commandments, He sets up in Israel for all time coming the great landmarks of righteousness towards one's neighbour.[6] Because He is God His conduct must be absolutely upright. Because He is the judge of the world, and therefore the highest source of all justice and all morality, He cannot show respect of persons, He cannot destroy the innocent with the guilty.[7] In His whole treatment of the people He shows Himself blameless in all things, mindful of justice, faithful to His promises and His statutes. With the merciful He is merciful; with the perfect, perfect; with the pure, pure; and with the froward, froward;[8] that is to say, He is the living standard of moral order. He hateth the wicked.[9]

Now, in the narratives of the Old Testament, there appears

[1] Ps. ix. 5, 8, 9, 17, l. 6, xcvi. 13; Deut. xxxii. 4.
[2] Isa. v. 16, x. 22.
[3] Gen. xlii. 22; Lev. xviii. 25; Ps. ix. 13.
[4] Ex. xx. 7, xxxiv. 7; Num. xiv. 18. Especially in Ezek. iii. 16 ff., xiv. 9, 23, xviii., xxxiii. 10 f.
[5] Lev. xxiv. 22. [6] Ex. xx.; Deut. v. [7] Gen. xviii. 23 ff.
[8] Ps. xviii. 26, 28.
[9] Ps. xi. 5 (Hos. xiv. 10. The ways of God are straight, and the just shall walk in them; but transgressors shall stumble therein).

to be a good deal that does not agree with this belief. For example, the partiality shown to covenant-friends, even when they are in the wrong, contradicts the true idea of righteousness.[1] But here, on the one hand, it must not be forgotten that God's special love and care of His people forms the foundation-stone of the whole conviction; and, on the other hand, that even Israel will, like the Canaanites,[2] "have to be spued out of the land of Jehovah," if he walk in their ways. In point of fact, according to the idea of ancient justice, the claims of a confederate and the claims of a stranger are quite different. Thus, justice demands that God's promises be fulfilled. Consequently, what appears strange to us was not, in the eyes of the narrators, at any rate, an infringement of justice on the part of God.[3] In like manner it might appear unjust in God to give Israel a land already in the possession of others. But it is always taken for granted that the sin of its inhabitants was already full;[4] that God, as the Lord of the whole earth, can take back what He gave; and that His covenant engagements required Him to give this land to Abraham's seed. Indeed, it is an eternal truth "that a people, rent by internal divisions, and sinking deeper and deeper in moral degradation, must succumb before another people in which there is springing up a vigorous and harmonious life, full of trust in divine power, and therefore striving after higher things" (Ewald).[5]

Finally, there is the very old objection that the spoiling of the Egyptians tells against the purity of the Old Testament idea of God's righteousness.[6] But, although one rejects the strictly allegorical interpretation of the passage,

[1] *E.g.* Gen. xii. 17, xx. 3 ff.

[2] Num. xxxiii. 56 (Deut. viii. 19 f.).

[3] Still, as de Wette rightly says, such stories are to be explained as due, not to imperfect ideas of God, but to an uneducated æsthetic and moral sense; morality is to be judged according to the spirit of the time and of the theocracy; cf. Lutz, p. 93 ff.

[4] Gen. xv. 16. [5] Cf. also Br. Baur, ii. 9. [6] Ex. iii. 22 ff.

according to which "the higher religion" is snatched away from the Egyptians by the people of God, as Laban's teraphim were once carried off by Rachel,[1] still the story itself is in no sense meant to describe a violation of the rights of property? God, who guides the history of the world, so arranges, that Israel is not sent forth from the land of unjust bondage without his wages. Hence the righteousness of God is working here in unison with His covenant love.[2] But the event itself is, on Israel's part, a simple demand which the Egyptians, according to divine arrangement, feel constrained to grant from fear of the miracles wrought by Jehovah. It is the Egyptians who break the peace.

When the piety of Israel has once become self-conscious, it is regarded as a certainty, not requiring proof, that all the decisions of God bear the stamp of perfect righteousness. Even were a person, with the intention of *benefiting God*, to forsake justice and truth, God would not accept his service, but would, on the contrary, punish him. Neither fear nor hope can ever induce Jehovah, the Governor of the world, to give an unjust decision.[3] He who is Himself the source of all justice,[4] and who, in judging the world, metes out the strictest justice[5] — He, the God of judgment[6] — will not punish the innocent for the sins of their fathers, but will hold every one responsible for determining his own destiny.[7] He reckons everything at its proper value, and does not allow injustice to pass itself off as justice, or to remain unpunished.[8] The psalmist knows that God would not hear

[1] Cf. Ewald, ii. 87. Schröring (*Zeitschrift für lutherische Theologie und Kirche*, ii. 1850, p. 284 ff.).

[2] Gen. xv. 14; Ex. iii. 21.

[3] Job. xiii. 6–12, 16 (xxii. 2–4, xxxiv. 14, xxxv. 5).

[4] Ps. xcix. 4.

[5] Deut. x. 17; Ps. lxxv. 3.

[6] Isa. xxx. 18; B. J. xxxv. 4, lix. 18; Deut. x. 18.

[7] Ezek. xviii. 24–27.

[8] Hos. xiv. 10; Isa. iii. 13; Zeph. iii. 5; Nahum i. 3; Jer. ix. 23, xi. 20, xii. 1, xx. 11, xlvi. 28; Ezek. vii. 4, 9, 27, viii. 18, ix. 10; Deut. x. 17, xxviii. 7 ff.; Joel iv. 2 ff.; Lam. i. 18; Ps. i., xcvi. 13.

him if he had, while praying, been cherishing wicked designs in his heart.[1] And it is one of God's prerogatives to abase the proud and exalt the lowly; in other words, to adjust, by His omnipotence, the unjust and arbitrary distinctions of earth.[2]

Trustworthiness and truthfulness,[3] together with righteousness, are the main elements of human honesty, and are the necessary foundation of confidence. Thus God is trustworthy, in the very highest sense. He shows Himself so when He swears by Himself.[4] His word which He pledged to the fathers He redeemed in every act of His providence. He gave them the land of promise, and raised up kings, as He undertook to do.[5] To Abraham, hoping against hope, He gives the promised heir by Sarah.[6] He leads the people under Moses, as He had promised, by mighty deeds, and with a high hand, into Canaan.[7] And, although it is said "He repents," that is really a naïve expression for His trustworthiness which, remaining inwardly true in altered circumstances, has therefore itself undergone an outward change.[8] He is true;[9] what He says, He really means. On this depend both law and prophecy. References to God's fidelity and truth are uncommonly frequent all through the Old Testament,[10] especially in the later times of distress, when the men of God had to arouse and strengthen the faith of the despairing people. Thus, in many instances, righteousness and faithful-

[1] Ps. lxvi. 18.

[2] Isa. ii. 12 ff. (v. 16); Ezek. xvii. 24, xxi. 31, xxxi. 14, xxxiv. 16; Job v. 11–16; Ps. cxxxviii. 6; Joel ii. 20.

[3] אמונה, Deut. vii. 9; נאמן, אמן to make firm; cf. האמין and אמת (For the word cf. de Lagarde, *Mittheilungen*, i. 105).

[4] Gen. xxii. 16, etc.

[5] Cf. Gen. xii., xv., xvii.

[6] Gen. xviii. 9 ff.

[7] Cf. Ex. iii. 6 ff., vi. 2 ff.

[8] Gen vi. 6; cf. Num. xxiii. 19; 1 Sam. xv. 22, 29 (2 Sam. xxii. 31).

[9] 2 Sam. vii. 28 (His words are pure, Ps. xii. 7); He hateth falsehood, Prov. xv. 26; cf. Ex. xxxiv. 6; Gen. xxxii. 12.

[10] Cf. *e.g.* for אמת, Ps. xxxi. 6, lxxi. 22, xix. 10, cxi. 7, liv. 7, xci. 4 cxlvi. 6, for אמונה, Hos. ii. 22; Lam. iii. 23; Deut. vii. 9, xxxii. 4; Ps. xxxiii. 4—together in Ps. xl. 11, 12.

ness are of course synonymous, or, at any rate, they explain each other.[1] The pious, when in distress, trusts to God's truth, and hopes that He will send it down from heaven, like an angel to guide him and be his shield.[2] In it lies the pledge that he who remains true to the covenant may also console himself with the covenant promises, that God keeps and does not forget His covenant.[3] God's word is pure. He is the rock on which men can build.[4] He alone is perfectly pure. For, measured by the standard of His eyes, God's most trusted servants are not pure, nor yet the heavens, not to speak of the creatures of the dust.[5] Hence, also, the law which reveals His will, is spotless, unalterable, and pure; a fortress in which men can dwell secure, amid all the change of earthly things, and all the uncertainty of human knowledge.[6]

(*b*) But integrity must be combined with "goodness," that the character may be perfectly trustworthy.[7] Hence Israel believes in the goodness of his God. This is in no way antagonistic to His righteousness. A man would not be "righteous" if he was not at the same time benevolent, ready to benefit and help, and, if need be, to excuse pardonable mistakes. No doubt this goodness of God — this "sympathy" for the weak[8] — depends absolutely on His own free will. He shows mercy to whomsoever He will.[9] And in the last resort, His honour is the highest goal. "The Lord hath made everything for His own purpose."[10] But out of His

[1] *E.g.* Ps. xxxvi. 6 ff., xcvi. 13, cxliii. 1, cxix. 38.

[2] Ps. xliii. 3, lvii. 4, 11, xci. 4, xcviii. 3, lxi. 8.

[3] Deut. iv. 31, vii. 9; Hos. xii. 1; Ps. xl. 11, lvii. 3 ff., lxi. 8, lxxxix. 14.

[4] Prov. xxx. 5; Deut. xxxii. 4, 15, 18, 30, 37; Nahum i. 7; B. J. xxvi. 4, xl. 8; Ps. xxviii. 1, cxliv. 1 ff.

[5] Hab. i. 13; Job iv. 18.

[6] Ps. xix. 8, 10, xciii. 5, cxix. 86, 89-91, 142, 160, 172; Eccles. xii. 13.

[7] 2 Sam. xv. 20.

[8] רחמים (adjectives חסיד and רחום). (2 Sam. xxiv. 14; Ex. xxxiv. 6.) For the expression, cf. Gen. xliii. 14, 30; cf. חמלת יהוה, Gen. xix. 16; Deut. x. 18; mercy towards orphans, widows and strangers.

[9] Ex. xxxiii. 19.

[10] Prov. xvi. 4.

goodness springs the creation of the world. Its glory and beauty declare this. But, above all else, the sight of man, who has been raised to the highest plane of created being, who has been made in the image of God, must recall the divine goodness. Even the artless prattle of children must become a power to convince scornful unbelievers of their folly.[1] From that which Christianity calls the love of God the Old Testament religion, especially in its beginnings, is still, it is true, very far removed. God's love is not bestowed on all nations alike. Down to the age of the prophets, the particularistic foundation of the idea of God is merely restricted, never quite abandoned. The God of Israel orders His foes to be ruthlessly exterminated. Human pity becomes wickedness when it spares the "banned." The God who fights the battles of Israel "among the mighty," and who has not yet laid aside the features of the terrible God of the Hebrews, is very far indeed from being recognised as the loving Father of all mankind.[2] God's goodness is primarily experienced as goodness towards His covenant friends, just as a man who is kind to his friends may be merciless to his foes.

Israel has had experience of God's goodness. The covenant with the fathers and with Moses is a work of pity and of love;[3] an adoption, by which the relationship established is that of child to father.[4] Thus, on the ground of this election, Israel experiences a special covenant love, which, as such, must of course be one-sided. It is God's delight to do good to Israel.[5] He lets His mercy continue for a thousand generations.[6] Without either obligation or necessity, He has loaded Israel with the benefits of salvation.[7] The greatest

[1] Ps. xix. 1 ff.; Ps. viii. 3 ff.

[2] Josh. vi. 17, vii. 12 f., 24 f., xi. 20; Judg. ii. 2; 1 Sam. xv. 2 ff., xxviii. 18; 1 Kings xx. 42.

[3] Ex. iii. 7; Judg. iii. 9, x. 10 ff., etc.

[4] Ex. iv. 22, 23.

[5] Jer. xxxii. 41.

[6] Deut. v. 10, vii. 9.

[7] B. J. xlviii. 11.

love of which men know, the love of a father for his son,[1] of a husband for the wife of his youth,[2] is a metaphor of God's love to Israel. Nay, all earthly love is weak compared with the highest divine love: "Can a woman forget her sucking child, that she should not have compassion on the son of her womb? Yea, these may forget, yet will not I forget thee."[3] Thus Israel celebrates the goodness of God in a thousand strains of tuneful praise.[4]

But this goodness of God towards Israel is no chance or arbitrary frame of mind. It depends on the deepest characteristic of the divine personality. God shows mercy to a thousand generations, but is angry only until the third or the fourth.[5] He is plenteous in mercy.[6] The mere sentence, "I am Jehovah," should be enough to move Israel to sympathy and to mercy.[7] The true Israelite confesses "I am not worthy of the least of all Thy mercies, and the truth which Thou hast showed unto me."[8] God's mercy depends on the overflowing goodness of His heart.[9] To the weak His very nature makes Him loving and sympathetic.[10] He heals broken hearts; He gathers into His bottle the tears of sorrow that they may not be forgotten. He loves the widow and the

[1] Hos. xi. 1; Deut. xxxii. 6, 10, xxxiii. 3; Isa. i. 2; B. J. xliii. 6, xliv. 24, lxiii. 16.

[2] Hos. i.–iii.; Ezek. xvi. xxiii.

[3] B. J. xlix. 15 (Jer. xxxi. 3; Hos. xiv. 5; Deut. iv. 31).

[4] Ps. v. 8, xxiii. 1 ff., xxv. 6, lix. 17, xxxi. 8, 17, 22, xxxvi. 6, 8, 11, xl. 11, xlii. 6, xlviii. 10, li. 3, lxvi. 20, cxviii., cxix. 76, 124, cxxx. 7, lxxxvi. 5; B. J. liv. 8, 10, lxiii. 7. (Hosea lays special emphasis on the attributes of God's disposition, i. 6, ii. 3, 21, iii. 1, vii. 8 ff., xi. 1, 8, xii. 1 ff.)

[5] Ex. xx. 5 f.

[6] Ex. xv. 13; Num. xiv. 18; Ps. vi. 5, xiii. 6; 2 Sam. xxiv. 16; "Jehovah repented Him of the evil" (Judg. ii. 18). The strongest expression occurs in Ps. xviii. 36, "Thy condescension hath made me great" (ענוה), if the text here be correct.

[7] Ex. xxii. 21 ff.; Lev. xix. 9–18, xxiii. 22.

[8] Gen. xxxii. 10; cf. xxiv. 12, 27; Ex. xxxiv. 6.

[9] Jer. xxxi. 18 ff.; B. J. lxiii. 16 (טוב, Ps. cxviii., etc.).

[10] רחמים (Deut. x. 18; B. J. xlix. 9), liv. 7, 10; Jer. xxxiii. 26; Joel ii. 13, etc. רחום, Deut. iv. 31 (B. J. lxiii. 7).

stranger; He pities the orphan.[1] The poor and needy who call on Him in deep distress, He gladly hears.[2] And from His people He Himself requires mercy and compassion.[3]

The more real the piety of Israel becomes, the better do they understand that God's mercy is the strongest force determining His will.[4] The pious are convinced that this mercy is based on God's position as Creator, and, consequently, has a foundation which, on principle, excludes particularism. God cannot will the destruction of those whom He has created; His heart impels Him to help the poor and the suffering.[5] The beauty and the order of creation proclaim His goodness. He gives His waiting creatures meat and drink so that they may praise Him.[6] All men without distinction receive the gifts which God has scattered with open hand.[7] Indeed, in the book of Jonah, it is said even of the heathen world that God can will for it nothing but life and happiness, that He must feel pity for His creatures.[8] God is not in the earthquake, nor in the whirlwind, but in the still small voice.[9]

In the Old Testament the particular word "Love" is hardly ever applied to God; and where it does occur in a later writer, it denotes God's special covenant love for Israel; and the reverse side of this is, of course, hatred of the hostile peoples.[10]

(*c*) The picture of perfect personal and moral life is completed by the idea of God's wisdom.[11] In the Old Testament this is, of course, presupposed from the first. God is, in fact,

[1] Deut. x. 18, xxiv. 10; Ps. x.1 4, xiv. 6; Hos. xi. 8, xiii. 4, etc.

[2] *E.g.* Isa. xxxvii. 15 ff., xxxviii. 2 ff.; Ps. xliv. 27, lxxxvi. 5, cxlv. 18, etc.

[3] Deut. x. 12, 18, xxiv. 17, xxvii. 19; Isa. i. 17; Zech. vii. 10.

[4] Ps. ciii. 8, 17, cxlv. 8; Joel ii. 13; Jonah iv. 2; Lam. iii. 22; Micah vii. 18; cf. Ps. lxxiii. 1.

[5] B. J. lvii. 16; Deut. x. 18; Jonah iv. 10 ff.; Gen. i.

[6] Job xxxviii.–xlii.; Ps. civ. 11 ff., 28 ff., cxxxvi. 1–9., cxlv. 15, cxlvii. 9.

[7] Ps. civ. 14 ff., cvii. 36 ff. [8] Jonah iv. 10 f. (Ruth ii. 20).

[9] 1 Kings xix. 11, 12.

[10] Mal. i. 2 f., אהב (Prov. iii. 12; Deut. vii. 8, 13; B. J. lxiii. 8 ff.). Still, passages like Gen. xxix. 31 and Prov. xxx. 23, show that the expression "hatred" is taken from the idiom of polygamy, and denotes, not hostility, but neglect.

[11] Cf. Bruch, *l.c.*, p. 123 ff.

the Creator, the Governor of the world, and the Lawgiver. But it is the Wisdom-literature that first busies itself expressly with this side of the idea of God. Indeed, it is only its later portions that begin to deal with a circle of ideas concerning divine wisdom, which is more nearly akin to philosophical speculation than anything else on Hebrew soil. Both the wonderful order in nature which God has created,[1] and the perfection of the moral statutes which is to be admired in His law, proclaim[2] that God is wise; that He has in Himself the utmost perfection of intellect, standard, and aims. God's wisdom alone gives the key by which to understand the world and man. The wisdom which gives a man true insight into the divine connection of things, as well as the real practical shrewdness which enables him to regulate his conduct by principles proved true from eternity,[3] is not a plant grown on human soil, is not a product of man's spiritual activity, and does not vary or have a conditional value like all purely human things. It is a real force, a phenomenon of objective significance. Man cannot attain it by any act of his own; he can only receive it in the fear of Jehovah.[4] It is the absolutely highest good. All the treasures of the earth and of the deep are not to be compared to it.[5] For it is nothing else than *the very wisdom of God*—in other words, the contents of His reason, of His own conscious life and will. It is nothing conditional or human, but the everlasting standard which is the goal as well as the origin of all created being.

Hence the wisdom of God is personified, obviously, it is true, in a free poetic style, just as its opposite, folly, is repre-

[1] Job ix. 4, xii. 13, 17, xxxvii. ff.; B. J. xl. 28, 13; Gen. i.; Ps. xix., civ. 24.

[2] Deut. iv. 8; Jer. x. 12; Ps. xix. 8 ff.

[3] Prov. vi. 1–11, xxii. 26, xxiii. 1 ff., xxvi. 17; cf. xxiv. 17 f., xxv. 21 ff.; Job xxviii. 28. The parable in Isa. xxviii. 23–29 shows that the order and the proportion observable even in the events of ordinary life are due to God.

[4] Job xxviii. 28.

[5] Prov. ii. 4, iii. 13 ff., viii. 11 ff., 19; cf. iv. 5 ff.; Job xxviii. 15 ff.

sented as acting like a person.[1] Consequently, the expressions must not be taken too literally. I cannot convince myself that any references are found in the Canon to the connection of this wisdom with the philosophico-religious conception of "the son of God"[2] and the first man.[3] One side of the divine activity is represented in free poetic fashion as a Being acting independently. But on the one hand this description is, like all Eastern poetry, very objective. Wisdom has a spirit and a word. It alternates with God as a subject absolutely synonymous.[4] On the other hand, the Eastern mind, which is specially intuitional, passes much more readily from a poetic picture to the actual idea of an independent personal existence than a Western thinker does. Hence we find here, certainly, the foundation of the pregnant thought that the inner conscious life of divine will proceeding from God, can be thought of as an activity independent of God; that it thus forms the foundation for the being and continued existence of the world, and finds its real and permanent expression in the personal life of man when modelled after the divine. Here, also, the real interest is a religious one, viz. to become conscious of the divine value of the commonwealth of the kingdom of God.

Wisdom was with God before the world was; she was brought forth by Him as the first of His works, that is, as the first objective expression of His being and will, so that God's purposes with the world and with man appear synonymous with His own eternal purposes.[5] She is the partner of His

[1] *E.g.* Prov. ix. 13.

[2] Ewald would take Prov. xxx. 4 in this sense. But the "who is his son" is plainly in the style of a proverb and has no special emphasis.

[3] Oehler and Dillmann would understand Job xv. 7 in this sense. But there the first man is evidently thought of, not as synonymous with the pre-mundane wisdom, but merely as the possessor of the deepest insight, in accordance with the idea that human experience is the greater, the farther it goes back.

[4] Prov. i. 23, 26, 30. (The parallel of the word חכמה is, in Prov. i. 2 f., בינה; in Prov. ii. 2 f., Ps. cxlvii. 5, תבונה; in Prov. ii. 10, דעת; and in Prov. ii. 11, מזמה.

[5] Prov. viii. 22; Job xxviii. 23 f.

throne and His associate.[1] By her He created the world;[2] by her He guides it.[3] She sports before God on His habitable earth; and her delight is with the children of men.[4] She then comes to men, addresses them as their best friend, recommends to them the path by which life is to be found, and invites them to the marriage-feast.[5] In a word, she wishes to embody herself, to become flesh in the moral and religious life of men. And, at the same time, she is God's peculiar possession. He alone knows her ways and understands her fully; He alone is the absolutely wise.[6]

Appendix. — The age of the Scribes afterwards made a real attempt to work out this side of the doctrine regarding God on theological lines. Certainly the books that became canonical after Ezra's time do not show any further development of the thought worthy of mention. Wisdom, as she appears in Qoheleth,[7] is thought of, in accordance with the whole anti-theological character of the book, not as speculative, but as purely practical. But this speculation becomes much more prominent in the apocryphal books, and especially in the Alexandrine philosophy of religion, strictly so called. Its great importance, in connection with the growth of Christian dogma, warrants a fuller exposition of it.

In the book of Baruch wisdom is poetically described in a manner similar to Prov. viii. She dwelt with God, and was then lent to Israel. Thus she was seen on the earth, and sojourned among men.[8] In the book of Jesus son of Sirach in its present Greek form, and in the book of the Wisdom of Solomon, she is described in almost exactly the same way; although in the latter book the tendency of the description to

[1] Prov. viii. 30.
[2] Prov. iii. 19 f., viii. 22 ff., 27 ff., 30; Job xxviii. 23 ff.; cf. Jer. x. 12; Ps. civ. 24.
[3] Jer. li. 15. [4] Prov. viii. 31. [5] *E.g.* Prov. ix. 2 ff.; cf. viii. 17.
[6] Ps. xxxiii. 11; Jer. li. 17; Job xii. 13 f.; Isa. xxxi. 2.
[7] Eccles. ii. 13 f., iv. 13 ff., vii. 12, 15 ff., viii. 1 ff., ix. 13 ff., x. 2 ff., 10 ff., xii. 1. [8] Bar. iii. 28 ff., 36 ff.

pass from a mere personification to an actual impersonation is decidedly more pronounced. True, in Oriental books of a rhetorical cast, it is always difficult to determine where the one ends and the other begins.

Wisdom is with God from eternity, the partner of His throne and cognisant of His thoughts.[1] She is an emanation from God's glory,[2] the brightness of His everlasting light,[3] the mirror of His power and goodness.[4] She is one, and yet can do everything; she remains within herself, and yet makes all things new.[5] She is of resplendent purity,[6] and has a spirit that is reasonable, holy, only-begotten. . . . beneficent, benevolent, absolute and independent, almighty and all-observant.[7] She is more in motion than any motion.[8] She was created before all things,[9] and boasts herself in the presence of God before His powers.[10] She is everywhere.[11] She is the principle of creation, especially of man's creation; for she has a spirit of love to men.[12] She is the artificer of the universe, poured out by God upon all His works.[13] She is the principle of redemption. She invites the righteous to heavenly possessions,[14] makes those who love her sons of God,[15] searches out those who deserve her,[16] descends into the souls of God's servants, and makes them God's friends and prophets.[17] She is the principle of divine revelation that seeks rest in and takes up her abode with men, and especially with the holy people; in other words, she serves, as it were, as priestess at

[1] Ecclus. i. 1; Wisd. Sol. viii. 3 f., ix. 4, 9 (μετά, πάρεδρος, μύστις, συμβίωσιν ἔχων).
[2] Wisd. Sol. vii. 25 (ἀπόῤῥοια, ἀτμίς).
[3] Wisd. Sol. vii. 26 (ἀπαύγασμα φωτὸς ἀϊδίου).
[4] Wisd. Sol. vii. 26 (ἔἰσοπτρον, εἴκων). [5] Wisd. Sol. vii. 26.
[6] Wisd. Sol. vi. 13.
[7] Wisd. Sol. vii. 22 ff. (νοερόν, ἅγιον, μονογενές, λεπτόν, πολυμερές, ὀξύ).
[8] Wisd. Sol. vii. 23. [9] Ecclus. i. 4, 7 ff., xxiv. 14.
[10] Ecclus. xxiv. 1 ff.. [11] Ecclus. xxiv. 4–9.
[12] Ecclus. xxiv. 10 ff., xlii. 21; Wisd. Sol. vii. 21, ix. 2; cf. i. 6.
[13] Ecclus. i. 2 ff.; Wisd. Sol. vii. 21.
[14] Ecclus. iv. 12, vi. 24 f., xv. 2 ff., xxiv. 7 ff., 18–31. (After these one always hungers and thirsts anew; cf. the words of Jesus, Matt. xi. 27 ff.)
[15] Ecclus. iv. 11. [16] Wisd. Sol. i. 4, 6, vi. 16.
[17] Wisd. Sol. vii. 27, viii. 1, x. 1 ff., 21, xi.

the holy places of public worship.[1] Wisdom is several times used as synonymous with God.[2] But it is specially important that she appears in connection with "the word of God,"[3] which is obviously the most active form of divine revelation; for, as manna, it feeds; as the serpent, it heals; and as the pillar of cloud it goes before the hosts of Israel. In Enoch, also, there are found allusions to these thoughts in connection with the Messiah, in whom dwells the Spirit of wisdom.[4]

In Hellenism proper this circle of ideas is most fully worked out by Philo, though not without visible traces of the influence of the Stoic and Platonic schools of philosophy. In Philo the idea of God is weakened down into the idea of absolutely spiritual pure Being.[5] Hence, in order to explain the world and God's revelation in it, he requires a medium. This he finds in the thought of the divine forces (ideas), which, as mercy and judgment, reveal the divine Being to the external world.[6] Their combination is the Word, the Logos, a term which Philo prefers, from its being of the masculine gender, to the word Wisdom, although, according to him, the contents of both are the same.[7]

The Logos is, on the one hand, the whole contents of the divine world of thought resting in the *Νοῦς* of God, synonymous with the inner life of God Himself, and corresponding to the *λόγος ἐνδιάθετος* in the human soul. On the other hand, it is the externalising of this as revelation, corresponding to the *λόγος προφορικός* in which man's thought finds expression.[8]

[1] Ecclus. xxiv. 7 ff.; Wisd. Sol. x. 1 ff., xi.

[2] Wisd. Sol. i. 4 f., ix. 17.

[3] Ecclus. i. 5 (?), xxiv. 3 f.; Wisd. Sol. xvi. 12, 26, xviii. 15; cf. vi. 12, vii. 22 f., ix. 1 ff.

[4] Enoch xlii. 1 ff., xlix. 3.

[5] 816 C, 916, 950, 1045 B, 1046, 1048 D, 1087 A, 1103; cf. 74 B, 600 C, 815 C E, 916 B, 1150, and often; cannot mingle with other being, 329 C, 479, 518, 805 B, 948, 1087 C.

[6] 139 A, 345, 504 D, 1048 D, 1150 (*κόσμος νοητός*, Enoch lxxi. 3).

[7] 176 E, 48 A, 458 B, 508 C, 498 D, 1103 B.

[8] 513 A, 672 C.

Thus the Logos is that which connects the divine ideas—their *place;* and that which connects the divine forces—the *Archangel.*[1] If a life is to originate outside God, then that is possible only by the life of God communicating itself by self-revelation; in other words, through the Logos. Hence, He is the master workman of the world;[2] the divider who brings into the lifeless and disordered mass of chaos the principle of form and order.[3] But He is, at the same time, the ideal of the world, as the thought of a work of art exists in the artist's soul before it is stamped on the material.[4] Above all He is the ideal, and therefore the goal of man; in other words, the ideal man in the image of God, of whom Gen. i. speaks.[5]

He is likewise the principle of revelation and redemption. Only through Him does the world exist before God. For if it did not contain some divine thought, it would not be entitled to exist. Hence, He is the High Priest who makes atonement for the whole world.[6] And wherever there are reconciling and redemptive influences at work in the history of salvation, these are revelations of the Logos. He was Melchisedek; He was the Builder of the tabernacle, the Rock in the wilderness, the Manna,[7] etc. He will at last lead the holy people again into their rest, in the superhuman form of an Angel.[8] These thoughts explain all the expressions which Philo applies to the Logos. He did not, of course, think of the Logos as personal, in the modern sense of the word, but as a force, influence, thought. The Logos is called the house of God,[9] the prince of the angels,[10] the effulgent likeness of God, the express image of His being,[11]

[1] 4, 5, 341 B, 509 B, 600.

[2] The separate ideas are the rays; He is the collective light. 6 A, 92 A, 416 C, 452 B, 466 D, 513 B, 823 C.

[3] Cf. 1. [4] 1248 D, 4, 817 B, 1150 B.

[5] 341. [6] 466 B, 509 B.

[7] 75 C, 76 E, 80, 92 A, 93 A, 176 E, 162 D, 179 C, 218 A, 438 D, 470, 507 B.

[8] 937 A. [9] 389 B, 418 A. [10] 341 B, 509 B, 600 D.

[11] 6 C, 80 C, 600 D, 823 C.

incomprehensible and infinite as God,[1] indivisible,[2] the second God,[3] the viceroy of God.[4] Only through the eternal thought of God, which also stands from all eternity before the eye of God as that which is to be realised, could a world exist outside of God and have a value as having come into existence, and as being in process of development. As High Priest, the Logos is a pledge to the world of its connection with God, and to God of the permanent value of the world. He thus stands between the two as Intercessor for the world.[5] In connection with this world, He is the governor and pilot, the charioteer of the divine forces, and the umpire.[6] By revelation he leads humanity, which has been created for Him, and especially the people of salvation, onward to their goal—to the realisation of His own being in humanity. Whatever saving influences exist among men are all, in the last resort, due to the Logos.

The further development, in Palestinian Judaism, of thoughts like these into the conceptions of the Jeqara, Memra, Shechina[7] and Adam Qadmon (the first Adam),[8] does not require to be discussed here.

3. (*a*) Among the "moral" attributes of God we did not mention His holiness,[9] because, according to the idiom of the Old Testament, it does not express any one side of His character, but describes the general impression which the pious have of God's relation to His creatures. While holi-

[1] The first-born son, 140 E, 298 B, 329 C, 341, 93 B, 452, 466 C, 497 D, 1046 D E.

[2] 513 B.

[3] 599, 600 D (ed. Mg. ii. 625).

[4] 398 B, 466 C, 600 E (79 A, σχιά). 466 B, 509 B.

[6] 398 B, 466 C, 600 E.

[7] Pirke Aboth 3. Ubi sedent duo qui legem tractant, Shechina cum illis est.

[8] The Bath Qol (Pirke Aboth vi. 2) is a term for the idea of revelation in the sense of the later age.

[9] קדוֹשׁ. Hence קדֹשׁ, נקדשׁ, התקדשׁ. It is linguistically connected with חדֹשׁ, חדֵשׁ, etc., and denotes what is "set apart," "made pure," מְקֻדָּשׁ. The opposite of קדשׁ is not טמא, but חל κοινόν, Lev. x. 9 (as טמא is the opposite of טהור).

ness was formerly regarded as the attribute which warded off from God whatever was evil and dishonouring to Him, that is, His moral sublimity, many modern scholars have put forward a different view. According to Diestel, as well as Achelis, God's holiness is meant to describe His direct connection with Israel through revelation—that is to say, an exclusive "property-relation,"—in other words, it expresses not so much the unapproachable moral majesty of God, as His inner relation to Israel. This view is exaggerated in a one-sided way by Menken,[1] who says: "By holiness is meant not so much the general unapproachable perfection and glory of God, which makes Him infinitely superior to all the excellence of all His creatures, as His condescending grace, His self-abasing humility, His humbling Himself in love." But this view is nothing more than plausible.

By far the most frequent use of the word "holy" in the Old Testament is in reference to the people, its customs, and its arrangements for public worship. There the matter is quite clear. A person, a people, a vessel, is holy, most assuredly, not because of its contents, but in so far as these things are "sacred," *i.e.* appropriated to God, and therefore called to share in God's dignity, and withdrawn from all profane or common uses. Some things, it is true, are in themselves more adapted for this than others, *e.g.* such as are perfect in themselves and worthy of honour (pure). Still even these are holy only in so far as they have been set apart for God. The word "hallow," which is so often used, simply means "to dedicate to a religious use," "to make a thing God's property," in contrast with putting it to "a profane or common use." The glory of God makes the tabernacle "holy"; the sacrifice "hallows" the altar. A "holy thing"[2] means either a place set apart for God's use, or a utensil dedicated

[1] Citing Ps. ciii. 1 ff., cv. 3; Hos. xi. 9; Ps. xxii. 4, xxxiii. 21.
[2] In the metaphorical sense (Ps. lxxiii. 17).

to His service. An earthly thing becomes holy by being appropriated to heavenly purposes. And the more directly it can be appropriated to God Himself, the holier it becomes, so that things belonging exclusively to God are "the most holy of all." Hence Diestel is perfectly right in saying of earthly things, "Holiness is a concept not of material but of relation." The "holy" are those dedicated to God, those who serve God in heaven and on earth.[1] Israel is a holy people because it is God's peculiar people; and a priest belonging to this people is especially holy.[2] And when conclusions as to the people's conduct are drawn from this relationship of property, Israel's "holiness" naturally requires material and moral abstinence from everything unbecoming a people dedicated to this God. Here, too, the concept of a property relationship is amply sufficient, with the natural explanation which it gets in the moral idea of God.

And this idea is equally sufficient where the poetry of the Old Testament speaks of God's holy arm, name, temple, heaven, etc. It merely emphasises the fact that everything which proceeds from Him, or in which He has a share, participates in the incomparable majesty of His being, and in His claim to be reverenced by man.[3] Many even of the passages in which God Himself is called holy could perhaps be explained without the help of any other idea—for example, the numerous passages, especially in the book of Isaiah, in which God is called "the Holy One of Israel." Even there it might possibly be only *the exclusive character of His relation to Israel* that is indicated. The expression would in that case be but slightly different from the title "God of Israel." Indeed in many passages where God is called without any special

[1] Zech. xiv. 5; Ps. xvi. 3, xxxiv. 10; Job v. 1, xv. 15.

[2] Ex. xix. 5 f.; Lev. xxi. 15, xxii. 9, 16.

[3] Ps. xi. 4, iii. 5, xx. 7; cf. the concordance for קדֹשִׁי and קדֹשׁוֹ. The passage, 1 Sam. ii. 2, is used without any special emphasis: God is the incomparable one (Ritschl). On the other hand, in 1 Sam. vi. 20, the word indicates the awful majesty of the divine Being.

emphasis "the Holy One,"[1] we might be satisfied with this explanation. But even in these cases the explanation of the term by the relationship of property is barely satisfactory, and does not do justice to the emphatic character of the word; and certainly the great majority of passages in which God is called holy, leads us to give a much fuller meaning to the term.

When God swears by His holiness,[2] there must be a reference to some unchangeable attribute of His own being. When the creature is awe-struck at God's nearness, because He is holy, when the Holy One of Israel is compared to a flame of fire, and stress is laid on His incomparably terrible majesty,[3] the word must be intended to indicate the gulf between God and the creature, that is, to express the consuming majesty of the divine Being. And when the Lawgiver, who has most logically developed the idea of the holiness of God and of His people, bases on the declaration "God is holy" a claim for holiness on the part of the people in such a way that a particular kind of material and moral national life is the result,[4] he cannot have intended his words to mean, "You must be Mine, because I am yours." That would leave the whole purport of his claim unexplained.

Hence, in the ordinary language of Israel, the holiness of God must denote the peculiar relation of Israel's God towards His creatures, and specially towards man. In the very earliest times the word must have denoted the consuming glory of the Semitic God; and it still carries with it something of the dread with which the ancient Hebrew regarded the terrible God who annihilates what comes near Him, and kills what is dedicated to Him.[5] At any rate it was primarily not

[1] Cf. *e.g.* B. J. xl. 25; Ps. xxii. 4; Hab. iii. 3, i. 12. Even the inscription of Eshmunazar calls the gods "holy."

[2] Amos iv. 2. [3] 1 Sam. ii. 2, vi. 20; Isa. vi. 3 ff., x. 17.

[4] Lev. xi. 44, 45, xix. 2, xx. 7, 26, xxi. 8; Num. v. 3.

[5] From the holiness of God it follows that contact with anything of His, or any changing of His arrangements, is fatal (Lev. x. 2 f.; Num. i. 51, 53, iii. 10,

a moral but a material idea. Fire and light appear to be the suitable forms of revelation for the Holy God.[1] The creature, as such, would perish in His presence. To disregard or violate the divine holiness brings down "the wrath of God," and the consequent destruction of the creature.[2] God is a Being exalted incomparably high above the world, who keeps His majesty free from every stain of dishonour, and wards off from His unique greatness even the slightest misjudgment or injury.[3] And everything that belongs to Him shares in this majesty, and claims the self-same reverence. Whatever earthly thing is holy possesses this character as being God's property, and must maintain it by withdrawing itself from all dishonour, from everything unclean and noxious.

Hence also the name "the Holy One of Israel" was certainly intended to describe God, not merely as the God of Israel, but as the unapproachable, incomparable One, in whom Israel may put his trust, although the world be hostile to him, and before whom he must tremble, should he himself prove unfaithful. The expression is emphatic, as when God is called a Rock or a Light.[4] We meet with this signification of the word "holy" wherever it is used emphatically of God. He dwelleth high and holy; He is the faithful Holy One.[5] An unclean people, prone to rebel, cannot serve Him, because He is holy—that is, tolerates no dishonour.[6] God hallows Himself—that is, preserves and reveals the incomparable majesty of His Being, and desires that He should be hallowed, that

38; Isa. viii. 14). He is an unapproachable terrible Lord, easily offended and provoked, threatening evil (1 Sam. xxvi. 19; 1 Kings xii. 15, xxii. 20 ff.; Amos iii. 6; cf. Ex. xxxiii. 20; Judg. xiii. 22; Isa. vi. 5. To יקדּשׁ corresponds the "sacer esto" of the Romans (Ex. xxix. 37, xxx. 29; Lev. vi. 11, 23; Josh. vi. 17 f.). Ex. iii. 5; Isa. vi. 3 f., and Gen. xxviii. 17 (Ps. cxi. 9) also show the connection between "holy" and "terrible."

[1] Ex. iii. 5; Isa. x. 17.

[2] 2 Sam. vi. 6 f.

[3] B. J. lvii. 15.

[4] Cf. especially Isa. x. 17.

[5] Hos. xii. 1; Prov. ix. 10, and indeed in the plural. Thus Job vi. 10; B. J. lvii. 15; Ps. xcix. 5, 9. Also in 1 Sam. vi. 20 the word must, at any rate, signify "unapproachable, terrible."

[6] Josh. xxiv. 19.

this unique majesty should be acknowledged.[1] He hallows Himself in Israel when He shows how unassailable He is by a hostile heathen world, and also when He resents and avenges any breach in Israel of His covenant rights. Thus His holiness is the consolation and hope of His people, and at the same time a source of holy dread to the wicked.[2] God's name is to be hallowed in Israel—that is, reverenced in its majesty.[3] He hallows Himself by righteousness, in other words, He guards, as Judge, the authority of His unassailable personality.[4] And everything which is the seat of His holiness becomes an object of holy dread, and destroys any unclean thing that touches it. While, according to the prophet, the Seraphim cry, "Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of Hosts," the sons of God, according to the ancient psalm, declare His glory in the heavenly temple.[5] To be holy and to be glorious, to be hallowed and to be glorified, may correspond exactly, because in both cases the majesty of the self-revealing God is displayed and maintained before the world.

(*b*) We have already alluded to the expression which surrounds the whole Old Testament picture of the divine Being as with a halo of light—viz. the glory of Jehovah.[6] What the religion of Israel denotes by this word is certainly, in the first

[1] Deut. xxxii. 51 ; Isa. viii. 13.

[2] Ex. xv. 11 ; Hab. i. 12 ; Isa. v. 16 ; Ezek. xxxviii. 16, 23, xxxvi. 23 ; cf. 1 Sam. vi. 20 ; Lev. x. 3 ; Josh. xxiv. 19. Probably Hos. xi. 9 also belongs to the first class of passages. God says, "I will not execute the fierceness of Mine anger, I will not return to destroy Ephraim ; for I am God and not man ; the Holy One in the midst of thee : and I will not come in wrath." If the phrase "the Holy One in the midst of thee" does not simply mean the same as "thine honoured Lord and God," then it must, like the antithesis of God and man, express the exaltation of the divine Being above earthly vicissitudes, and of His will above the changes of His counsel.

[3] *E.g.* Lev. xxii. 32.

[4] Isa. v. 16 ; Ezek. xxxviii. 23, xxxix. 27.

[5] Isa. vi. 3 ; cf. Ps. xxix. 9, xcix. 3, 5, 9 (Ezek. xxxvi. 23 to magnify oneself, Lev. x. 3). The distinction between the two terms is brought out most clearly by remembering that from the glory of God moral inferences can never be drawn by His worshippers, and that God's holiness as such can never be manifested.

[6] כבוד יהוה.

instance, the actual presence of the God of light—God's revealed glory as it appears to His favoured ones in all its awful grandeur and majesty;[1] and in this signification[2] the word still occurs in Ezekiel and in A. But the phrase generally denotes the special majesty of God's revealed Being, the perfect fulness of His Godhead, which the creature has to acknowledge, praise, and glorify. It is this which, according to the early psalm, "day preaches to day and night to night," in words which are heard even unto the utmost ends of heaven. It is this which the sons of God rejoice to celebrate when, as they watch in the palace of God the progress of the revealing thunderstorm, they keep saying, "Glory, glory." God proves this attribute of His upon His enemies because He wishes to show them that He is the King of Glory.[3] Thus, too, in later days, the poet prays that God's glory may be exalted above the heavens and the earth[4]—in other words, that God may cause every created thing to acknowledge His incomparable majesty. And the prophets hope that God's glory will fill all lands in quite another way than heretofore, that all creatures will have to acknowledge this God as the Most High, as the perfect fulness of the Godhead.[5] God means to set His glory among the heathen—that is, to be acknowledged and worshipped even by them.[6] On its account He will not give His people to the heathen as a spoil.[7] This glory all beings are to ascribe unto God; that is, they are to praise and glorify Him according to the measure of the divine majesty that is revealed unto them.[8] This glorifying of God and of His name is the highest thing for which an Israelite, as well as a disciple of

[1] Ex. xxxiii. 22; cf. iii., xvi. 7, 10, xxiv. 16.

[2] Ex. xxix. 43, xl. 34, 35; 2 Chron. v. 14, vii. 1; Deut. v. 24; Ps. xxvi. 8; Ezek. xliii. 2, 4; B. J. xl. 5.

[3] Ps. xix. 1, xxix. 1 ff., 9, xcvi. 3, cxxxviii. 5; Isa. vi. 3; Jer. xiii. 16 (in Ps. viii. 2, 10 "the name" of God is quite synonymous; Ex. ix. 16, xiv. 18; Ps. xxiv. 7.

[4] Ps. lvii. 6, 12.

[5] B. J. xxxv. 2, xl. 5; Num. xiv. 21.

[6] Ezek. xxxix. 21.

[7] Num. xiv. 12 ff.

[8] B. J. xliii. 7; cf. lix. 19 f.; Hab. ii. 14; Ps. xcvi. 7.

Jesus, can pray, "Not unto us, O Lord, not unto us, but unto Thy name give glory."[1] This God of glory is of course perfectly blessed in the fulness of His being, and without a single want—a God who out of His mere good pleasure can give all things, but asks for nothing; from whom all receive, but to whom nothing is ever given.

> "The Lord is in His holy temple,
> Let all the earth keep silence before Him."[2]

(*c*) From the holiness of the morally perfect God, the attitude which God takes up towards human sin follows as a matter of course. This relation is summed up in the old phrase, "He hateth sin."[3] He is not a God, as was said later, who delighteth in iniquity; evil shall not dwell with Him; He is of purer eyes than to behold evil.[4] Breaches of the great statutes of right and equity are to Him an abomination.[5] But owing to His holiness and His mercy this antagonism to sin shows itself in different aspects.

When human sin assails God's holiness and honour, especially when Israel breaks the covenant God has made with him, or when heathen nations show hostility to His honour or His purposes of salvation, or when anything happens in Israel injurious to the holiness which beseems the people of this God, then His wrath and holy indignation are aroused.[6]

In the concrete conception of God current in the earlier ages, and in accordance with the original idea of His holiness, both these words undoubtedly imply the thought of human

[1] Ps. cxv. 1.

[2] Ps. xvi. 2, l. 9–12; B. J. xl. 28 ff., xlvi. 5 ff.; Hab. ii. 20; Zech. ii. 13.

[3] Ps. xi. 5.

[4] Ps. v. 5; Hab. i. 13; Lev. xxvi. 15 ff.; Deut. xii. 31; B. J. xxvi. 9, lix. 2, lxi. 8.

[5] Prov. xii. 22, xv. 8 f., 26, xvi. 5, xxi. 27 (תועבה).

[6] אף, חרון, עברה, חמה, זעם, קצף, קנאה, קנא אל (קנוא, Josh. xxiv. 19); Gen. vi. 6; Num. xii. 9; Ex. xxxii. 10 ff.; Deut. iv. 24, vi. 15; Josh. xxiv. 19, vii. 26; Ex. xx. 5, xxxiv. 14; Num. xxv. 11; cf. Num. xxxv. 33 f.

passion, and the impression of the terrible God of the Semites is still visible. The ancient Hebrews too tremble before a mysterious wrath of God.[1] Not only does God's wrath destroy without mercy the enemies of His people, but it blazes forth whenever His sanctuary is touched by any profane person or thing;[2] when the people complain and murmur needlessly; when the spies show themselves cowards; when their own kindred rise up against Moses and Aaron.[3] When the angry breath of God's nostrils is spoken of, or when it is said that God whets His sword, or that He is angry all the day,[4] these are but poetic metaphors taken from the martial wrath of an insulted hero. Only from this point of view could the godly man pray:

> "O Lord rebuke me not in Thine anger,
> Neither chasten me in Thy hot displeasure;
> Punish me but with justice."[5]

Such expressions take it for granted that the wrath of God, like that of men, will, if left to itself, overleap the bounds of equity. Only on account of thoughts like these did it require to be expressly stated—as for instance by Micah[6]—that it was not blind rage but the wickedness of Israel that drove God to the use of threats. But because the conception of God's wrath is still mixed up with the idea of human passion, it is said, especially in later times, that God does not give free rein to His anger, at least within the limits of His covenant. He is God and not man. Hence He will not act according to the fierceness of His anger. He is not always wroth; else the spirit would fail before Him, and the souls which He had made.[7] Taking this restriction for granted, we may say, therefore, that all through the Old Testament, the anger of God is represented as the natural excitement of the Holy

[1] Lev. x. 6; Num. i. 53, xviii. 5; cf. Ex. xii. 13, xxx. 12; Num. viii. 19.
[2] Num. i. 53, viii. 19.
[3] Num. xi. 1, 10, xiv. 37.
[4] Ps. vii. 12 ff. xviii. 9 ff.
Ps. vi. 2; Jer. x. 24 (cf. also the expressions in Jer. xv. 15, xxii. 7).
[6] Micah ii. 7.
[7] Hos. xi. 9; B. J. lvii. 16 f.

God, conceived of as rising into passion, when His holiness and honour are assailed, when His heart boils over like a burning fire.[1] This wrath of God naturally falls, in the first instance, on those nations that attack Him by assailing His holy people; on those who, without any divine commission, show themselves hostile to Israel, and set themselves "against the Lord and His anointed."[2] This wrath next falls on Israel when, forgetful of the covenant, he serves other gods or dishonours the name of God by scornful disregard of justice and morality. For God dishonours those who dishonour Him.[3] For instance, the breach of Israel's plighted troth to the Gibeonites through Saul's acts of violence is punished by the wrath of God.[4]

On the other hand, there is nowhere any mention in the Old Testament of God being angry, on account of original sin, with those members of His people who remain honestly faithful to their covenant with Him. On the contrary, such persons have perfect confidence in His mercy. Just as little is God angry with the nations of the heathen world at large, when they do not interfere with the history of revelation. It was only in later times, in the sorrowful days of oppression, that men saw the wrath of God in the miseries of human life itself, and attributed these also to the unconscious sin of the people.[5] In this we are witnessing a transition to a deepened consciousness of sin, such as Hebrew antiquity knew nothing of. No doubt the early Hebrews, like their heathen contemporaries, thought it possible to incur the anger of God unwittingly, or, at least, without any evil intention, but just through some unconscious, that is to say,

[1] Zeph. ii. 2, iii. 8; Nahum i. 5, 6; Deut. iv. 24, ix. 3, xxviii. 63; Isa. xxx. 27, 30, xxxiii. 14; B. J. lx. 10, lxi. 2, lxiii. 5 f., lxiv. 5, lxvi. 14; Ps. xxxviii. 4.

[2] Ps. ii., lxxiv. 18; Ezek. xxxvi. 23, xxxviii. 16, 23.

[3] 1 Sam. ii. 29.

[4] 2 Sam. xxi. 1 ff.; cf. Amos i. 3–ii. 3.

[5] Ps. xc. 7 ff. Still even here external violation of God's holiness by His people may be meant.

not wickedly intended, violation of His holy things, or of the ordinances of His law. That follows from the previously explained conception of God's holiness which, in fact, includes both the material and the moral. Where men believed that they recognised God's anger in the miseries of their lot, they sought to discover the cause of that anger by consulting oracles and prophets. But no one ever thought that God's anger was due to man's moral inability.[1]

Somewhat narrower than the idea of God's anger, but otherwise essentially similar, is the idea of God's jealousy or zeal, which is found in all the Old Testament writings, but is especially frequent in those subsequent to the Deuteronomic period.[2] This jealousy naturally presupposes the marriage relationship, and can therefore be only thought of when there is a question as to some violation of the holy bond which unites Israel to God. Hence the reference to God's jealousy stands, as Geffken justly observes, after the first and second commandments, not after the rest. When Israel worships other gods, it arouses the jealousy of Jehovah.

This jealousy of God is also directed against Israel's enemies, and consequently is represented as a motive for God's deeds of deliverance whenever Israel is, contrary to his own will, separated from his God, and dishonoured by strange nations and gods. Then the jealousy of the husband endeavours to save the imperilled honour of the wife.[3] But where the people faithlessly turn away of their own accord

[1] A clear instance of this is 2 Sam. vi. 6; 1 Chron. xiii. 9 (2 Chron. xv. 13), where the wrath of God falls on the non-Levitical person who touches, with a good intention, the sacred ark. There the anger is caused by disregard of God's "holiness." The higher the idea of God's transcendental and holy character became, the more did every breach of His ordinances and forms appear to be a challenge of His anger. This is specially true of A and the Deuteronomistic editor of the historical books.

[2] All the expressions mentioned here are very frequent in the prophetic writings. God's anger is spoken of with special frequency by Jeremiah (iv. 4, 8, 26, 28, vii. 20, 29, etc.), the Deuteronomist, and Ezekiel.

[3] 2 Kings xix. 31; Isa. ix. 7; Zech. i. 14, viii. 2; Joel ii. 18.

from their God, and worship other gods, then the zeal of God is a zeal of indignation and judgment which, in turn, gives up and divorces the wicked people.[1] This wrath and jealousy of God determine His final judgment of the world.[2]

As a perfect man dare not tolerate insults to his honour or infringements of moral order, but treats them with anger and indignation, it follows on the other hand from his merciful disposition that, so long as there is a possibility of his adversary repenting, he will restrain his anger, and not be quick-tempered; and that, wherever it is not a question of wicked purpose, but only of unintentional offences, or where the adversary seeks forgiveness, and proves himself really sincere in his professions, he too will be ready to forgive and become reconciled. Both attributes are predicated of God when He is called "long-suffering"[3] and "gracious."[4] God does not give His people up even when they break the covenant. He bears with them notwithstanding all the sins of their history. Even after the time of the Judges He raises them up a David, and is never weary of inviting His people back again by the mouth of His servants. And the later age understands full well that all God's chastisements were intended to spare the people their worst sufferings, because He has no pleasure in the death of the sinner, but rather that he should turn from his evil ways and live.[5] With long-suffering patience God restrains His anger for His own name's sake, because His purposes of revealing mercy are bound up with this people.[6]

[1] Deut. iv. 24, v. 9; Zeph. i. 18; Nahum i. 2; B. J. lix. 17, lxiii. 15; Ezek. v. 13, viii. 17, xvi. 38, xxiii. 25, xxxvi. 5, xxxviii. 18 ff.; Ps. lxxviii. 58, אל קנא, Deut. vi. 15; Josh. xxiv. 19.

[2] *E.g.* 2 Sam. xii. 14. Because thou hast given occasion to the enemies of Jehovah to blaspheme, thy child shall die (Ps. xciv. 1, 10).

[3] ארך אפים, Ex. xxxiv. 6; Num. xiv. 18.

[4] חנון and חן, Jonah iv. 2; Ex. xxxiii. 19, xxxiv. 6.

[5] Deut. v. 10; Nahum i. 3; Ezek. xviii. 23; Jonah iv. 2; Ps. lxxxvi. 15, ciii. 8 (Micah vii. 18; Zeph. iii. 9).

[6] Hos. xi. 9; B. J. xlviii. 9.

And when the sinner returns, God willingly becomes reconciled. In order to deal with such sin as does not break the covenant, He has had His holy place of reconciliation set up. And even when a man has separated from Him, God yearns to forgive. He longs to pass by the transgression, to repent Him of the evil.[1] Even in wrath He is not forgetful of mercy. He lets Himself be found, and invites the sinner to turn to Him with full confidence.[2]

God's anger and jealousy on the one side, God's long-suffering and mercy on the other, are in no sense contradictory or meant to counterbalance each other. On the contrary they stand, by preference, side by side.[3] The same passage which says that God will by no means clear the guilty, says also that He is slow to anger. The same statute which proclaims that God will punish sin till the third and fourth generation, tells also of His great mercy, and declares that He takes away and pardons sin. There is forgiveness with God for the very reason that He may be feared.[5] For truly religious fear can be awakened only by a God who does not inexorably insist on the law of retribution, but who knows how to forgive and be gracious. In the heart of a true man zeal for the honour of his house, and for justice and morality, must be combined with a patient and placable disposition. So also, in the case of God, anger and jealousy are thought of as co-existing with long-suffering and tender mercy. Still we may well suppose that, in the earlier ages, Israel thought more of God's anger and jealousy, and that the knowledge of His mercy and long-suffering in all its glory dawned but very gradually on the people.

[1] Ex. xxxiv. 7; Num. xiv. 18; 2 Sam. xxiv. 10, 16; Joel ii. 13; Amos vii. 3, 6; Jer. xviii. 8; Jonah iv. 2 ff.; B. J. lvii. 18.

[2] Isa. i. 18 ff.; Hos. xiv. 5; Joel ii. 13; Micah vii. 18; B. J. lv. 6 f.; Jonah iv. 11; Ps. xli. 5, li. 3, lxxxvi. 5, 15, ciii. 8, cxi. 4, cxvi. 5, cxlv. 8 (B. J. lxiii. 9, lxv. 1); cf. Joel ii. 18; Hab. iii. 2; 1 Kings viii. 50; Lam. iii. 31; Ps. lxxviii. 38 (xxxii. 6, עת מצא).

[3] Nahum i. 2 f.; Ps. ciii. 8.

[4] Ex. xx. 5 f., xxxiv. 6 f.; Num. xiv. 18.

[5] Ps. cxxx. 4.

CHAPTER X.

CREATION AND PROVIDENCE.

LITERATURE.—Plank, "Die biblische Lehre von der Schöpfung der Welt" (*Deutsche Zeitschr. für christl. Wissenschaft und christl. Leben*, ed. Schneider, 1853, 43, 44, 49, 50); P. Kleinert, "Zu der alttestamentliche Lehre vom Geiste Gottes" (*Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie*, 1867, i.).

1. In the Old Testament the relation of the world to God is, from the very first, unhesitatingly declared to be that of the creature to the Creator. The Semitic religion, with which that of the Hebrews is connected, may indeed have understood the thought of creation only in the limited sense of a fitting up of the world. But the pious in Israel are so very clear in their conception of a personal *supra-mundane* God that a pantheistic development of the world, or the existence of it side by side with God, never occurs to them. And scientific interest occupied so entirely subordinate a position in Israel's thought, that the question whether the origin of the present form of the world might not be a mere development, or whether the existence of it might not be regarded as a continued process of growth, could not be so much as raised.

That God was the Creator of the heavens and the earth was always a settled question for Hebrew piety. The oldest Psalms tell us that the heavens declare the glory of God, and that His majesty is celebrated by the earth, so that its hymn of praise resounds above the heavens.[1] Hence the beauty and order of the world is His work; and the chief end of the world is to glorify the majesty of the divine Being. Certainly the narrative by B is not really meant to give an account of the creation, but to serve as an introduction to

[1] Ps. viii. 2 (תְּנָה ?), xix. 1 ff.

the history of the world and of man. Still it does relate that God created the heavens and the earth, made the trees grow out of the ground, developed by a mist the seeds of vegetation, and formed man and beast of the dust of the ground; that is to say, He freely exercised, in inner harmony with the growing world and its laws, His own creative energy.[1]

All this is said again and again in the Psalms, in the speeches of the prophets, and in the declarations of the prophetic period. The Spirit of God—that is, the moving principle of His own life—is the spirit of life in beings innumerable.[2] The word of God proceeding from Him, produces, in accordance with His will, the forms of the world.[3] The wisdom of God makes the everlasting standards and laws of the divine life the foundation of the natural laws and moral order of the world's life.[4]

That God created or fashioned the world[5] is very often stated; and nowhere so often as in the later Psalms, and by the exilic Isaiah. The statement is not made for the express purpose of teaching this doctrine, but is either due to the direct welling-up of thankful joy at the Creator's goodness and mercy,[6] or is used in order to strengthen and renew the people's faith that the Almighty is constantly at work in their behalf, by reminding them that everything has been called into being by Him; or finally, in order to meet man's insolent murmurs by the decisive declaration that the creature can no more contend with the Creator, than the potsherd with the potter who made it out of senseless clay.[7] In this sense it is said that heaven and earth arose at God's command and by

[1] Gen. ii. 4*b*–iii. [2] Ps. xxxiii. 6, civ. 29, cxxxix. 7; Job xxxiv. 14 f.
[3] Ps. xxxiii. 6, cvii. 20, cxlvii. 15, 18.
[4] Prov. viii. 22–32; Job xxviii. 23 ff.; Ps. civ. 2 ff., cxxxvi. 5 ff., etc.
[5] יצר, עשׂה, Ps. xcv. 4 f.; Jer. x. 16.
[6] Ps. xxiv. 2, xxxiii. 6 f., lxxxix. 12, lxv. 7, cvii. 24, cxxi. 2, cxxiv. 8, cxxxiv. 3, cxlviii. 5; Isa. xxxvii. 16; B. J. xl. 28, xlii. 5, xliv. 24, xlv. 12, 18, xlviii. 13, li. 13.
[7] Isa. xxix. 16; Jer. xviii. 6; B. J. xlv. 9.

His wisdom;[1] and that the beauty and the order of the world proclaim its Maker's glory.[2] And not merely the world as such, but every individual development in it is an expression of God's creative will. Every one of these, it is true, is also a result of the great laws and ordinances of nature. The earth revolved; the sea burst its swaddling-bands.[3] But it is none the less God's free will, in accordance with which these ordinances have produced such results; of independent laws of nature the Old Testament knows nothing. The order of nature is simply the expression of Divine wisdom.[4]

Thus, like every living thing, man, too, is produced, both body and soul, by ordinary generation; and every child has a life-long connection with its parents.[5] But it is equally certain that the living force in each individual also depends on the Spirit of God;[6] and every individual knows that he is the direct creation of the God who fashions the heart of man and puts the spirit within his body, who already knows the life that is forming, writes in His book beforehand the day of birth, and has prepared the reins in the womb.[7] The order of nature is in no wise antagonistic to God's creative activity, but is merely the expression, visible to the creature, of the power of God directed by His wisdom. Biblical traducianism is, indeed, opposed to that scholastic creationism, which conceives of a soul distinct from the body, being called forth directly from God, but not to the religious creationism which is convinced that each individual is an immediate expression of God's creative will.

[1] Ps. xxxiii. 6, xcv. 4 f., xcvi. 5, cii. 26, cxlvi. 6, cxxxvi. 5; Job xxxvi. 3, xxviii. 25.

[2] *E.g.* Ps. civ. 10 ff.; Job xxxviii. 4–xxxix. to the end.

[3] Ps. xc. 2, civ. 6–9; Job xxxviii. 8 ff.

[4] Ps. civ. 1 ff., 29, cxxxvi. 5; Prov. viii. 22–32; Job xxviii. 23 ff.; B. J. xliii. 7.

[5] Deut. v. 9; Ps. li. 7; Job xiv. 4.

[6] Ps. civ. 29; Job xxxiv. 14 f. (x. 8, xxvii. 3).

[7] Ps. xxxiii. 15, xcv. 6, cxix. 73, cxxxix. 13, 16; Zech. xii. 1, Job x. 8, xxxiii. 4; Jer. i. 5, xxxviii. 16; B. J. lvii. 16.

As to detailed theories regarding the events of creation, opinions were, before the time of Ezra, perfectly free and undefined. The succession and the order of the individual acts of creation were depicted in a free poetical style.[1] Not till the Levitical period was an endeavour made, in dependence on A, to begin a definite theological tradition.[2] In the earlier books we seek in vain for information regarding the philosophical questions that may be connected with the idea of creation—for example, as to how creation is related to time, and to the existence of matter; and whether matter is to be conceived of as eternal, or whether the world was created absolutely out of nothing. When scholars formerly thought that such questions might be decided, for example, from Job. xxvi. 7, they forgot that the "nothing" upon which God founded the earth[3] is not that out of which the earth is created, but the immeasurable void of space, the abyss above which they imagined that the terrestrial orb was kept hovering.

A thorough treatment of the creation question, and one undertaken of set purpose, is found only in the narrative by A, with which the Old Testament as we now have it begins. It is meant to describe a creation, in the strict sense of the word. For in making God's week of labour end with a day of rest,[4] it draws a clear distinction between the creative acts of God and His ways of revealing Himself to the completed world.

On a closer examination of this narrative, its present form can scarcely be regarded as quite original. Expressions such as "And it was so," "And God saw that it was good," "And God made," etc., have been used here, evidently in the interests of a definite system of sacred numbers, or been put in the wrong places.[5] The body of the narrative is probably very much older than A, who has merely edited it, incorpor-

[1] So Ps. civ. 6–9; Job xxxviii. 7. Even Ps. xxxiii. 6–9 merely repeats the simple religious elements in the idea of creation.

[2] Ps. cxxxvi. 6 ff.; Eccles. iii. 11, vii. 29.

[3] על-בלימה.

[4] Gen. i. 7–ii. 4*a*; especially ii. 1 ff.

[5] *E.g.* i. 30, "And it was so."

ated it in his work, and fitted the narrative into the frame of a working week, which winds up with a Sabbath.[1] Even this narrative gives us neither philosophical nor scientific information, but simply the fundamental thoughts of religion as to God's relation to the developing world and its laws. And whatever material there is in it for natural science or philosophy, it certainly does not claim to do more than reproduce the views on these subjects which prevailed in Israel, at the time it was written. In fact it need not have had any special connection with Israel, or even been generally current only among that people. Biblical religion, as a whole, is in no way responsible for these views, or for any of their contradictions of modern science.

In this narrative, too, God is represented as connected with existence outside of Himself by the concept of "the Spirit and the Word of God."[2] God's vital force, which is represented in a concrete way as His breath, proceeds from Him, and becomes the source of created life in whatever it breathes upon. Over the lifeless and formless mass of the world-matter this spirit broods like a bird on its nest, and thus transmits to it the seeds of life, so that afterwards, at the word of God, it can produce whatever God wills. And His word creates the world—that is, God's inner world of thought becomes, through His will, the source of life outside of Himself. The Spirit and the Word of God are represented as forces locked up in God. The Spirit appears as very independent, just like a hypostasis or person.

To the metaphysical question, about the world being made out of nothing and about the origin of matter as making the world possible, our narrative gives no answer. Even though the usual translation were right, which sees in Gen. i. 1, taken as an

[1] This cannot be considered doubtful, in view of the character of the revision undergone by the Decalogue, and of the intention of this writer to assign to antiquity the origin of the sacred customs.

[2] רוח יהוה, Gen. i. 2 ; cf. Deut. xxxii. 11. [3] From Gen. i. 3 onwards.

independent sentence, an account of the creation of matter previous to the six days' work, the question would not be clearly answered. The verb used for "create," which primarily denotes nothing more than a working up of given material,[1] has, it is true, in the idiom of the language, had its meaning restricted to such action of God as produces something new;[2] but it certainly may pre-suppose, as is at once shown by the following verses,[3] the presence of matter for this divine activity to operate on. It is clear, however, that this translation is quite wrong. For without taking into consideration the fact that בְּרֵאשִׁית can properly occur, as the Jewish grammarians have already seen, only in a prepositional and conjunctional clause, since its very form implies dependence on the following sentence, the phrase "the heavens and the earth" cannot possibly denote "matter," because from ver. 2 onwards the earth alone is in existence, and out of it "heaven and earth" are not made until the firmament is created. Besides, "heaven and earth" is the standing phrase for "the created, finished world," and it is so used just in reference to the six days' work.[4] Hence the words cannot mean, at one and the same time, *the starting-point* and *the result* of the divine action. Now in view of the phrase "in the beginning," and also of the second verse, it is absolutely impossible to regard the first verse as a superscription to the six days' work. Then ver. 2 corresponds exactly to the form of a Hebrew circumstantial clause, which usually appears as the second member of a period,[5] and the whole sentence has a perfect parallel in Gen. v. 1 ff., that is, in the opening sentence of A's second narrative.[6] Moreover, when we consider that ii. 4*a* stood originally before i. 1 as a superscription, and was, for obvious reasons of form, put in

[1] ברא. Elsewhere עשׂה, יצר, יסד, הכין, כונן.

[2] Ex. xxxiv. 10; Num. xvi. 30; Ps. li. 12 (of a spiritual creation B. J. xliii. 1–15, lxv. 18; Ps. cii. 19).

[3] Gen. i. 21, v. 1 f.

[4] Gen. ii. 1–4*a*, xiv. 19–22; Ex. xxxi. 17 (Gen. ii. 4*b*).

[5] Ewald *Gram.* § 341*a*.

[6] Cf. in Schrader *l.c.*, p. 47 ff.

here just to mark off the next narrative, being thus changed into a sub-scription, the sentence becomes quite similar to the form of sentence A generally uses. Hence we see ourselves compelled, with Ewald, Bunsen, Schrader, and others, to translate: "In the beginning when God created heaven and earth, —now the earth was without form and void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep, and the Spirit of God was brooding upon the waters,—God said, Let there be light."[1] Hence there is nothing stated here about the origin of matter.

God's first act, when producing our present world, was to give the command, which created light as the life-producing element in the universe. When this first act took place, there existed a condition of things in which the earth, including in it at that time the heaven, presented itself to God as a chaotic mass, shrouded in darkness and covered with water. As to whether this condition was itself eternal, produced out of itself, or temporal, called forth by the will of God, our narrative says nothing. This purely metaphysical question is not so much as touched upon here, any more than in the kindred cosmogonies of the Chaldeans and the Phœnicians, and is not solved of set purpose in any part of the Old Testament. Hence, in later times, even the Alexandrian view of the eternity of the "μὴ ὄν," as an explanation of the origin of the world could be quite well harmonised with the Biblical doctrine of Creation, as soon as it referred all actual finite being and life absolutely to God. But that it was decidedly at variance with the real meaning of our narrative, admits nevertheless of indirect proof. When God, the possessor of heaven and earth,[2] can make everything good, that is to say, finds nowhere any hindrance in anything already in existence, which, having its origin in some other being, is antagonistic

[1] On the analogy of Hos. i. 2; Deut. iv. 15, a change of the vowels into בְּרֹא after v. 1, is not at all necessary. To make one's individual taste the standard by which to judge this translation, as Wellhausen does, is not a permissible procedure in matters of this kind.

[2] Gen. xiv. 19-22.

to Him;[1] and when to His word "Be" comes the willing "And it was;"[2] in other words, when matter obeys the divine command like a willing servant, it is assuredly taken for granted that everything, even this chaotic matter which obeys the creative word of God, is included within the will of God, and called forth by Him. And who can doubt that A had this conviction? That it is nowhere expressly taught is simply due to the fact that A had really no occasion to raise this metaphysical question. Least of all had he ever thought of the daring conceptions of a world-wide catastrophe and a world-wide restoration with which modern theosophy has credited Old Testament science.[3]

In what relation time stands to creation is another question likewise left untouched. Even in the ordinary interpretation of Gen. i. 1 "the beginning," being merely contrasted with "the end,"[4] would denote the beginning of the history of the world without reference either to time or eternity. But according to our interpretation we are simply told with what the

[1] Gen i. 31. [2] Gen. i. 3, 6, 11, 14.

[3] Since the time of J. Böhme, not a few theosophists have maintained that v. 2 is meant to describe what the world, created according to v. 1 as a κόσμος, became in consequence of a fall in the world of spirits. This thought, which would be natural enough in the circle of thought that produced the book of Enoch, is, if our translation of the text be correct, absolutely without foundation. But even if ver. 1 be taken as an independent sentence, such a thought is against both language and sense. If ver. 2 were meant to describe something that happened only subsequent to ver. 1, and indeed through the discontinuance of what was there stated, it could not have been said "now the earth was והארץ היתה," but "and the earth became" (ותהי הארץ). But since היתה is used, and with a participle too, in the parallel clause, which certainly can describe only a continuous condition, ver. 2 must describe something that is either synchronous with what is stated in ver. 1 or is included in it. Hence the situation cannot be different in the two verses. But even apart from these reasons, it is a postulate of correct thinking not to assume that a thought has fallen out between two successive sentences, which requires to be stated before the second sentence can be properly understood. Any one who sets aside this postulate, may read the whole system of Christian doctrine out of any heathen book. Besides the notion of a fall of angels before the creation of the world (different from the narrative in Gen. vi. 1–3) is altogether opposed to the view of the Old Testament. Satan is not a fallen angel.

[4] The history reaches from ראשית to אחרית (Delitzsch).

work of creation began, and out of what the present form of heaven and earth was then produced in six days. Still it is undoubtedly taken for granted that time, as it exists for us, is merely a category for created things; in other words, that the world, as such, cannot have come into being within the limits of this time, but itself includes it. For the first day runs its course within creation itself,[1] and is therefore a part of the world's being; and before "the first day" time is of course inconceivable. Chaos is without motion, development, and growth,—therefore also without time. But such abstract questions are altogether foreign to Old Testament piety.

The religious thoughts, which are really contained in this narrative may be summed up as follows:

(1.) God and the world are distinct. The sum of Being outside God is an object on which God acts; it exists therefore apart from God. The vivifying Spirit of God broods over the universe. It is God's word which calls into being each individual form,—not a thought, an inner self-development of God, as the Pantheism of the Hindoo represents. Hence God establishes everything through a voluntary intentional expression of His will: He spake and it was done; He commanded and it stood fast.

(2.) God and the world are not independent. One form of life does not originate from another according to a dead, mechanical law; nor does God call forth life in an arbitrary, disorderly manner, in defiance of the laws of His own world. The laws of the world are an expression of the divine will. The earth itself "brings forth." The individual life is developed out of the organic totality of nature by the forces and laws which God has put into it by means of His vivifying Spirit. But the earth brings forth at God's word and command, obeying His will, and fulfilling it by her order. Between the order of nature and the will of the living God there is no antagonism; the two are one.[2]

(3.) God and the world are not opposites. The earth on which

[1] Gen. i. 5.

[2] Gen. i. 20, 21, 24.

God works as Creator is, it is true, a dull, dead, moaning mass—a chaos.[1] All the civilised peoples of antiquity take it for granted that the world, before it became a well-ordered living whole, existed without either order or light, as a chaos pregnant with future being, and the possible foundation of true life. According to B, moisture is the means of engendering life; according to A, the world begins to grow out of moist matter when once the primeval flood which prevented the development of life is dried up. Now, our narrative, as has been pointed out, does not expressly say that this chaos was the product of God's will. But although the world has not in itself the power to produce order and beauty, it is nevertheless the willing instrument of God's Spirit, which broods upon the face of the waters. It is not antagonistic or evil. It places itself at God's command, so that He can make everything "very good"; and He, on His part, rejoices over it and blesses the creatures on it.

2. In the growth of individual creatures, creation and preservation run into each other. In the narrative of B the two are still directly interwoven; and although the narrative of A purposely separates the two by the idea of the Sabbath, it, too, conceives of the development and continued existence of the creature as dependent on the continuance of God's creative activity. The same idea runs all through the Old Testament. Hence, to quote some of the earlier passages, God takes away the breath of life as He pleases; that is, its continuance depends upon His will.[2] He saves life—that is, it is in His hand.[3] He is the Lord of life, the God of the spirits of all flesh.[4] When He no longer allows His Spirit "to rule" in the individual creature, it sinks

[1] תהו ובהו the Phœnician Baau, the Hindoo world-egg, the Chaldean world-woman, the Greek χάσμα πελώριον.

[2] Gen. vi. 3; cf. ii. 17. Cf. generally the flood, the overthrow of Sodom, the slaying of the Egyptian first-born, of the Korahites, etc.

[3] Ps. xviii. 17 ff.; Gen. viii. 1; cf. 21 ff., etc.

[4] Num. xvi. 22, xxvii. 16.

back into its own nothingness, into the mass of matter without attributes.[1] In like manner, when God gives rain and drought at will; when He rules the elements as "cloud-compeller,"[2] and uses at His pleasure the forces of nature;[3] when, at the wave of His hand, the hosts in heaven's vault run their courses, rejoicing like heroes and warriors,[4] the order of nature is but the expression of His almighty freedom.

The existence and further development of the created world depends entirely upon God's will as to its continuance or preservation. This comes out with special clearness in the thought already mentioned that the blessing of offspring, even against hope, is due to Him alone.[5] Hence all the self-developing life of created beings issues forth from His will as well as from the womb of nature. In the later writings it is just the same. The continuance of life is every moment dependent on God. "Thou hidest Thy face, they are troubled; Thou withdrawest their breath, they expire and return to their dust; Thou sendest forth Thy breath, they are created; and Thou renewest the face of the ground."[6] God allows men to die, and says, "Return, ye children of men."[7] He threatens death, and retracts the threat.[7] He cuts the thread of life.[8] His care preserves the spirit of man.[9] In the shadow of His wings men are safe; in His light they see light.[10] In His book all their days are written, and He determines the course of their lives. Hence His book is the book of life.[11] For all flesh is grass—is, in comparison with God, absolutely without strength of its own, and without assurance of permanence.[12] In like

[1] Gen. vi. 3. [2] Gen. ii. 5, vii. 11 ff., etc.
[3] Gen. xix. 24, especially in the plagues on the Egyptians, *e.g.* also Ex. xvi. 16 ff.; Ps. xxix.
[4] Ps. viii. 1 ff., xix. 5 ff., xviii. 8 ff.
[5] Gen. xv. 5 f., xviii. 10 ff., xxv. 21—esp. Gen. xxx. 2, 8 (Ps. xxxi. 16, xxxiii. 6 ff.).
[6] Isa. xxxi. 3; Job xxxiv. 14; Ps. civ. 29 f. [7] Ps. xc. 3.
[8] Isa. xxxviii. 1 ff., 12; Job xxvii. 8. [9] Job x. 12.
[10] Ps. xxxvi. 8. [11] Ps. xxxix. 5 ff., lxix. 29, lxxxix. 16, cxxxix. 16.
[12] Ps. xc. 5 f.; B. J. xl. 6.

manner, the hand of God is seen in all the ordering, propagating, and maintaining of created life. Children are His gift; and He forms the spirit of man within him.[1] He giveth rain and fruitful seasons;[2] He causeth the grass to grow for the cattle, and corn and wine for the sustenance of man.[3] To Him the young ravens cry for food, and the beasts of the field pant unto Him.[4] Again, it is He who assigned to every kind of animal its special form of existence, who "made the ostrich forget wisdom, and did not impart unto her understanding."[5] In short, it is He, as Amos says,[6] "that formeth the mountains and createth the wind, and declareth unto man what is his thought, that maketh the dawn darkness, and treadeth upon the high places of the earth; Jehovah, the God of Hosts, is His name; He that maketh the Pleiades and Orion, and turneth deep darkness into the morning, and maketh the day dark with night; that calleth for the waters of the sea, and poureth them out upon the face of the earth; Jehovah is His name; that causeth destruction to flash forth upon the stronghold, so that destruction cometh upon the fortress."

3. The God who preserves the world is the God of Israel. Creation and preservation reach their goal in the history of the kingdom of God. The kernel of religious faith in God's sustaining power is the faith of the saints in His providence. The way in which God develops nature, according to His own will, already points to higher objects. Nature must serve to realise His purposes. Its first purpose is, by its beauty and goodness, to praise the Lord, and to reveal to man the fulness of His power and wisdom,[7] to be the mirror of His glory and goodness.[8] But He also guides it according to His

[1] Zech. xii. 1; Gen. xvii. 17 ff.; Ps. cxxvii. 3.
[2] Jer. iii. 3, v. 24, xiv. 22; Ps. civ. 13, cxlv. 16; Gen. ix. 14 (νεφεληγερέτης).
[3] Ps. civ. 14 ff., 27, cxxxvi. 25, cxlv. 15 f.
[4] Job xxxviii. 38–41; Ps. civ. 21, 27; Joel i. 20.
[5] Job xxxix. 17.
[6] Amos iv. 12 f., v. 8 f., ix. 5 ff.
[7] Ps. viii., xix.
[8] Ps. civ. 31, cxxxix., cxlvii. 8, 17–19.

purposes with man.[1] Snow and hail are His weapons, piled up in His heavenly armoury. The thunder is His voice of menace, which announces His going forth to battle.[2] Everything in nature must serve as a means of attaining the great moral ends of the kingdom of God on earth. Fertility and drought are means of education in the hand of God. Hence as a land, the fertility of which is not like that of Egypt, due to regular and, as it were, absolutely certain conditions, but the welfare of which depends entirely on the refreshing rain, Canaan is in a pre-eminent degree a land of faith.[3] The swarms of locusts are God's hosts, which proclaim the day of His anger;[4] and in the general conceptions of the last day, the catastrophes of the natural world play an important part.

Now the full expression of this faith is the idea of miracle, which is exactly the same all through the Old Testament. Israel never concerns itself any more than did the other religious peoples of antiquity with the question of how miracles can be reconciled with the fixed laws of Nature. For in these ages the idea of nature being governed by fixed laws had never been broached. No doubt even the Old Testament in its later writings speaks of a covenant of God with day and night, and of the bounds which He has prescribed for the several powers of nature, beyond which they cannot pass.[5] But of an order of nature, inviolable even by the divine will, no one ever thinks. Only in one very late Psalm, and even there in quite an indefinite way, do we get a sort of hint as to such an order in nature as is, like the moral law, an inviolable ordinance of God.[6] Every event in Nature is looked at merely as a single act of God's free will, rain and sunshine as well as earthquake and prodigy. Consequently the essence of a

[1] B. J. xlvi. 11, xlviii. 15 f. [2] Amos i. 2; Job xxxviii. 23; Joel iv. 16.
[3] Deut. xi. 12 ff., xxviii. 12, 23; Lev. xxvi. 3, 15 ff.; Job xxxviii. 25; Ps. lxv. 10 ff., cxlvii. 15 ff.; Hagg. i. 7 ff.; Jonah i. 4, ii. 1, 11, iv. 6 ff.; Joel i. 4 ff., 17 ff.
[4] Joel ii. 11 (that execute his word).
[5] Jer. xxxiii. 20, 25; Ps. civ. 9; Job xxxviii. 10. [6] Ps. cxlviii. 6.

miracle is not that it is "unnatural," but that it is a specially clear and striking proof of God's power, and of the freedom He exercises in furthering His objects. It does not stand out as an irregular individual occurrence, in contrast with a differently ordered whole; but it stands out as a specially striking individual occurrence, in contrast with other single events, which, being less striking owing to their frequency, are less calculated to produce the impression of God's almighty power in executing His purposes.

The whole Old Testament regards the miraculous as a matter of course. No pious man ever doubts that when God wishes to give His servants special help, by standing by them, and punishing His enemies, the necessary occurrences must take place, be they ordinary or extraordinary. Nothing happens without a cause; everything depends on God, whose word never returns to Him void.[1] By such signs Moses is sustained in his arduous task;[2] according to the later narrative, they are constantly happening to Elijah and Elisha.[3] In order to show His favour, God gives the barren a son.[4] He lets loose the plagues of heaven and of earth on the contemporaries of Noah, on Sodom, and on Egypt. Contrary to all the ordinary conditions of existence, He sustains Israel in the wilderness. He proves by the destruction of the Korahites, by Miriam's leprosy, and by the death of Aaron's sons, His unassailable holiness in Israel.[5] Man does not live by bread only, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God. Is anything too wonderful for God?[6] Thus poetic expressions and idioms, occurring in the narrative, grow into pictures of historical events, be they never so contrary to experience.[7] In the historical narrative, especially of the

[1] Amos iii. 4 ff.; B. J. lv. 10 f.
[2] Ex. iv. 2 ff. (C), vii. 8–xiv. (composite).
[3] 1 Kings xvii.–2 Kings vii.
[4] Gen. xxi. 1, xxv. 19 ff., etc.
[5] Gen. vii., xviii., xix.; Ex. vii. 8 ff.; cf. Num. xii., xvi.; Lev. x.; 1 Sam. v.
[6] Gen. xviii. 14 (B); Deut. viii. 3 f.
[7] How they arise from poetical expressions is seen with the utmost clearness in Josh. vi. 5, x. 12 f.; Ex. xvii. 10 f.; Judg. xv. 19. In this connection the

Deuteronomic writers, we find events recorded as occurring in the early ages which, according to our ideas, contradict in the strongest way possible the natural order of things.[1]

A miracle is not represented as something exclusively at the command of Jehovah. It is also within the power of other Elohim, because they too have power over nature, as higher beings with full freedom of action.[2] Hence Deuteronomy declines to accept a miracle as a sufficient proof that a man is sent by God.[3] Nor does it ever occur to the narrators that the miraculous accounts they give are absolutely incompatible with ordinary experience. For it often happens that these miracles, being comparatively natural, are similar to natural events that also occur elsewhere, as was long ago remarked in reference to the plagues in Egypt, the passage through the Red Sea, the manna, the quails, and the springs of water.[4] The eye of the saint detects "a miracle" where the dull glance of the ordinary man sees nothing but commonplace occurrences. For him the working of God in the ordinary incidents of daily life is so astonishing as to become miraculous. We meet with this idea, in its most attractive form, in a number of somewhat late Psalms.[5] Consequently the real peculiarity of a miracle is simply this,—that, at specified times, striking incidents, closely connected with moral ends, occur in the domain of Nature, at the word of God, or in answer to the prayer, or bidding of men sent by Him. Here the decisive element is the teleological—that is to say, the agreement of events in nature with those in the

passage, Judg. v. 20, is worthy of notice, "They fought from heaven; the stars in their courses fought against Sisera," for in it the purely poetic colouring is still present, but, at the same time, the transition to a miraculous story, such as we find in Josh. x. 11 f., is clearly indicated.

[1] Josh. x. 10 ff., xxiv. 7; Num. xxii. 28.

[2] Ex. vii. 11, 22, viii. 7, 18, ix. 11. (The magicians are probably thought of as working under the influence of their special Elohim.)

[3] Deut. xiii. 1–3.

[4] Ex. x. 13, 19, xiv. 21, xv. 25; Num. xi. 31, xx. 8.

[5] Ps. xcvi. 3, xcviii. 1, cvii. 8, cxxvi. 3; cf. lxvi. 3, cxxxix. 14.

sphere of morality. As a matter of course, the natural event must be of such a singular character as to awaken surprise, and produce the impression that God has been making free use of His omnipotence. But what is considered singular varies very much according to circumstances. The domain of miracle includes stories calculated to prove the absolute omnipotence of God—as, for instance, when God bestows beforehand a three-fold blessing on the Jubilee and the Sabbatical year, when manna gathered on the Sabbath proves uneatable, when at the prayer of Moses the plagues cease at a given hour, when the land of Goshen is not touched by the plagues that ravage all the rest of the country, when the sun stands still, etc.,—as well as the simpler examples already mentioned where the teleological element alone points to the miraculous, and even significant names and symbols.[1]

A miracle is primarily in its outward form an unusual outstanding act,[2] a mighty deed.[3] Its character is so outstanding as to take it completely out of the category of ordinary events. It gives the impression of being something awe-inspiring, something terrible,[4] because it reveals the Lord who ought to be feared. As an expression of God's directly creative power, it is "a creation."[5] But its chief use is to convince, to act as a sign[6] that the living God is in the midst of His people,[7] as a pledge by which God, as the absolutely Supernatural, attests the com-

[1] Ex. viii. 4 f., 18 f., 24 f., ix. 4 f., 26, 28 f., x. 23, xi. 7, xvi. 18, 24 f.; Lev. xxv. 21; Josh. x. 12 f.; cf. Isa. viii. 18.

[2] נפלאה, Ex. iii. 20, xxxiv. 10; Josh. iii. 5; Judg. vi. 13; Ps. lxxi. 17, lxxv. 2, etc. פלא, B. J. xxv. 1; Ex. xv. 11 (the verb, Gen. xviii. 14). The idea is that of being "singular." Similarly מופת, Ex. iv. 21, vii. 9, xi. 10; Ps. cv. 5, "distinguished." This term is generally combined with אות (Ex. vii. 3; Ps. cxxxv. 9), and is sometimes weakened down to the meaning of the latter word.

[3] גדולה, 2 Sam. vii. 23; 2 Kings viii. 4; Ps. lxxi. 19, cxxxvi. 4; Job v. 9, ix. 10. הגדיל לעשות, Joel ii. 21.

[4] נוראה, Ex. xxxiv. 10; 2 Sam. vii. 23.

[5] בריאה, Num. xvi. 30; cf. Ex. xxxiv. 10, נפלאות אשר לא נבראו.

[6] אות, *e.g.* Ex. iii. 12, xii. 13, xiii. 9; Judg. vi. 17, etc., 36 ff.

[7] Josh. iii. 10.

mission of His messengers, and confirms their words. Hence the miraculous is also specially connected with the holiness of God.[1] In itself, it is true, every outward act may be a sign in which a spiritual one is symbolically represented and, as it were, authenticated. But, naturally, it is the more significant the more directly the act itself, as being an extraordinary and wonderful occurrence, produces on the spectators the impression that God Himself is acting. Hence, all through the Old Testament, the miraculous is quite openly accepted as a matter of course. Still, it must also be said that, comparatively speaking, it is kept very much in the background. It is only in the post-exilic period that there is anything like a real passion for the miraculous.

4. The most difficult side of this question is to understand the relation of the divine activity to personal beings conscious of their own actions. Piety demands such an emphasising of God's action as would logically take away man's freedom. Moral consciousness, on the other hand, demands a freedom which, looked at by itself, would exclude all divine co-operation and order. It may be impossible for philosophy to solve this contradiction, based, as it is, on the inability of finite thought to comprehend a divine activity that works in a way unlike anything in the present world. But the Old Testament knows nothing of this dividing gulf—or, indeed, of this whole difficulty —as is invariably the case with simple faith. It holds fast to the moral claim. The emphasis it lays upon moral duty, and the prominence it gives to the responsibility which every one has for his own destiny, are clear enough proofs of this.[2] The prayer of the pious is represented to be a power that influences God, as simple faith will always maintain.[3] A prophetic blessing, given to those in favour with God, is considered an

[1] Ex. xv. 11; cf. Ps. lxxvii. 14 f.

[2] *E.g.* Gen. xvii. 2; Ex. xx. 2 ff., 12, etc.

[3] Gen. xviii. 23, xxiv. 12 ff. (xx. 7, 17), xxv. 21; Ex. viii. 4 ff., 24 ff., ix. 28, x. 17.

influence that will bind destiny, bind it even in spite of a subsequent change of will on the part of him who gave the blessing.[1] Thus human piety feels the freedom and efficacy of human action, combined with a naïve assurance of faith. The whole moral teaching of the prophets is based on the conviction that God holds every man responsible for freely determining whether he is to be saved or condemned.[2] But with equal emphasis, and without the slightest feeling of any contradiction between the two views, the Old Testament insists that the sovereign will of God finds expression through the free will of His creatures, and that nothing which the free will of man ever does is thereby removed beyond the influence of the divine will. God is the potter and man the clay.[3] The most difficult of all problems in connection with this whole view, viz. how sin and evil can be reconciled with this power on the part of God, is not raised at all even in the later books. It is said not only that God made everything good,[4] but that sin and evil come to man from God.[5]

The relation of God to human freedom is most simply expressed in the words, "God is King"[6]—that is, God directs

[1] Gen. xxvii. 27, 33; Ex. xii. 32.

[2] Ps. i.; Isa. i. 14 ff., v. 4–7; Job v. 6; Deut. xi. 26, xxx. 15, 19; Jer. xxi. 8.

[3] Jer. xviii. 5 ff.; Amos iii. 6; Lam. iii. 38; B. J. xlv. 7, 9, lxiv. 7 (Isa. xxix. 16). The words in B. J. xlv. 7 can hardly refer to the dualism of Cyrus, of which the prophet can scarcely have been aware. It does not say, "In order that thou (Cyrus) mayest know Me." The question is as to the temptation to see in the defeats sustained by Israel the influence of other gods. In Ex. xxi. 12 f., involuntary homicide is represented as "an act of God."

[4] Gen. i. 31.

[5] B. J. xlv. 7; Amos iii. 6. Although Hoffmann thinks that רָעָה and בְּעָר must be read here (alarm, תרועה, side by side with שׁופר; cf. Ex. xxxii. 17), *i.e.* an alarm by a "watchman" or prophet (since false prophets do not warn), still since nobody would ever think of acknowledging that all evil comes from Jehovah, it appears to me that the context points directly to the fact that people must be on their guard before God, the Judge who may condemn. Whether Israel did not also, in patriarchal times, attribute "evil" to other gods than Jehovah, we cannot determine. But the doctrine of Amos is that every event in the history of the world is to be attributed to Jehovah (i. and ii.).

[6] Ps. xxix. 10.

by His orders even the manifold varieties of human development. In what unbelief regards as chance, faith sees an act of God.[1] This conviction is most directly expressed in the doctrine of retribution. The everlasting moral will of God makes its influence on human destiny felt in this way—that every act of opposition to it brings its own punishment, every voluntary act in harmony with it its own encouragement and reward. In the older writings, this doctrine is taught with all the confidence of a religious axiom. In the life both of the people[2] and the individual,[3] the relation to God is thought to determine the lot, so that man's free will is controlled by God's. Even in late ages this belief is often represented as axiomatic.[4]

We are carried further by the view that all human action, however it may be meant, must nevertheless tend to fulfil the counsels of God, especially for the benefit of the children of God's people. All the hostile acts of the world against the patriarchs of Israel turn into blessings.[5] The whole history of Joseph proclaims the truth of what C puts into the mouth of God's favourite, "Ye meant evil against me, but God meant it for good."[6] The exposure of Moses and the risk he ran of perishing, his act of homicide and his flight, must all help forward the wonderful plans of God for this chosen servant of His.[7] In like manner, the Egyptians themselves, whose hearts God touches, must see to it that God's people do not go forth without booty from the land of bondage.[8] All

[1] Ex. xxi. 13; Prov. xvi. 33.

[2] Ex. xx. 8 ff.; Ps. vii. 17; Judg. ii. 14, 20, iii. 8, 12, iv. 2, vi. 1, x. 7, 17; cf. Ex. xxiii. 25 ff.

[3] Ex. i. 20 f.; Prov. x. 9, 24 f., 28 f., xi. 8, 21, xii. 3, xiii. 9, 21, 25, xiv. 11, 19, xx. 20 f., xxi. 18, 21, xxii. 12.

[4] Lev. xxvi.; Deut. xxviii.; Josh. xxiii. 15; Ps. i., v. 13, ix. 19, xxv. 13, xxxiv. 11, 20, xxxvi. 13, xli. 2, lv. 24, lvii. 4, cxix. 165; Isa. iii. 10; Hos. xiv. 10; Jer. xvii. 5; Prov. i. 31, ii. 8, 21, iii. 1, 8, 10, 21, 32, iv. 4, 10, v. 21, vi. 15, x. 24, 28.

[5] Gen. xxvi., xxx. 26–xxxi. 54, xxxii. 4 ff., xxxv. 5.

[6] Gen. l. 20 (xlv. 5, 7, 8, 9).

[7] Ex. ii. 1 ff., 11 ff., 21.

[8] Ex. iii. 21, xi. 2.

that Saul, in his hostility to David, can do, only serves to increase the power and influence of Israel's true king, whom God has chosen.[1] In these and a hundred other instances the history of the Old Testament celebrates the God who laughs to scorn the haughty plans of the mighty ones of earth,[2] the God from whom cometh victory and the disposing of the lot,[3] who guides the hearts as well as the footsteps of men,[4] of whom it is said, "Man proposes, God disposes,"[5] and of whom the poet sings, "His eyes behold, His eyelids try the children of men, to put to shame all the wicked devices of His foes."[6] This faith in the will of God, deciding the lot of man and overruling all his actions, meets us even in the latest ages in all the freshness and vividness of the earliest. The haughty might of Assyria is for God as an axe in the hand of the woodman; and as soon as He has accomplished His work on Zion by the help of the Assyrians, they are thrown aside. The king of Babylon who said, "I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God," has to descend into Sheol. Asia's conquering monarchs, however little they may imagine it, are the servants of Jehovah, called by Him to chastise the people of God, or to liberate and exalt them.[7] The prophet who means to shirk his duty is compelled by the sea, by storm and miracle, to obey God's will.[8] "I know," says Jeremiah, "that the way of man is not in himself: it is not in man that walketh to direct his steps."[9]

This conviction was the root of the confidence and hope, the humility and devotion, which form the chief characteristics of Old Testament piety. "Except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain." Unto God belong the treas-

[1] 1 Sam. xix. ff. (xx. 15); cf. *e.g.* 2 Sam. xvi. 10, xvii. 14; 1 Kings xii. 15.
[2] Ps. ii. 4.
[3] Prov. xvi. 33, xxi. 31.
[4] Prov. xvi. 7, xx. 24, xxi. 1.
[5] Prov. xvi. 9, xix. 21.
[6] Ps. xi. 4, 6.
[7] Isa. x. 5, 15 f.; B. J. xiv. 13, xli. 2, 25, xliv. 21, xlv. 1; Jer. l. 2 ff., 9, 41, li. 11, 20 ff., 28.
[8] Jonah i. 3 ff., ii. 1, 11.
[9] Jer. x. 23; cf. Job xxxviii. 12 ff., xl. 2 ff.

ures of the world; unto Him, also, belongeth victory; He putteth down and lifteth up; Canaan was won, not by Israel's sword, but by God's right hand,—so say the Scriptures, thus condemning all self-exaltation.[1] In condemnation of despondency and the fear of man, they tell us that "God carries out His plans in spite of everybody; no power on earth can hinder Him.[2] He appoints the times and destinies of men from of old;[3] He causes both good and evil.[4] His angel destroys the proud hosts of the enemy, and encamps round about those that fear Him.[5] Without Him nothing can happen; He creates the workman who forges the sword, as well as the destroyer who wields it; no evil can happen in the city without His permission."[6] Finally, in order to give courage and hope to the suffering saint, it is said, "The Stone which the builders rejected is become the Head of the Corner. This is the Lord's doing; it is marvellous in our eyes.[7] He that keepeth Israel neither slumbers nor sleeps; He giveth to His beloved in sleep.[8] A thousand shall fall at thy side, and ten thousand at thy right hand; but it shall not come nigh thee.[9] The tears of the saints are put into God's bottle."[10] Thus the life-blood of Mohammedan piety, faith in God's providence, is quite as strong in the Old Testament, but it is even more vivid and has not yet degenerated into fatalism.

Since everything turns out at last to be in accord with God's counsel, of course all history, and above all the history of salvation is traced back in a very special way to the direct action of God. It is from this point of view that we must

[1] Prov. xx. 24, xxix. 26; Hagg. ii. 8; Zech. x. 3; Ps. xliv. 4, 7, cxxvii. 1, lxxv. 8.

[2] Ps. xxxiii. 10, 11, 16, lx. 13, lxii. 12, lxxvii. 11, xciv. 11, cxviii. 6, cxlvi. 3.

[3] Isa. xxii. 11; Ps. xxxi. 16.

[4] Isa. xxxi. 2; B. J. xlv. 7; Job xi. 10; Lam. iii. 38.

[5] Isa. xxxvii.; Ps. xxxiv. 8.

[6] Amos iii. 6; B. J. liv. 16; cf. Hos. xiii. 12; Hab. i. 12; Ezek. xxxiii. 2.

[7] Ps. cxviii. 22 f. [8] Ps. cxxi. 4, cxxvii. 2. [9] Ps. xci. 7.

[10] Ps. lvi. 8.

judge the way in which all the writers of the Pentateuch have done the work of narration. God calls Abraham, leads, guides, and blesses him; just as He chooses him, on the other hand, to be a source of blessing to his descendants.[1] It is God who gives Jacob the skill to manage his business affairs, and increase his wealth.[2] He not only sends Moses, but He specially communicates to him every particular of the campaign and every single commandment.[3] In short, the whole history of salvation is the immediate "doing of God." We must also understand it in the same way, when God enjoins the carrying off of the Egyptians' valuables, when He orders the extirpation of the Canaanites, and when He resolves to reveal His glory to Pharaoh by destroying him.[4] All action of this kind, every ordinance which furthers the history of redemption, every combination of circumstances which makes it clearer than ever that the kingdom of God stands on a moral foundation, is represented as due to the direct action of God, who not merely permits it, but brings it about. At the approach of Israel, the nations are panic-stricken, because they discern the hand of the divine ruler of the universe who has destined this land for Israel.[5] Even the non-subjugation of Canaan is represented as pre-arranged "in order that Israel might learn war."[6] In the same sense, the prophets proclaim that God protects His holy people, and carries them as an eagle carries its young; that the servants of God among this people destroy and plant, convert and

[1] Gen. xii. 1 ff., xviii. 19 (B). [2] Gen. xxx. 28 ff. (B, C).

[3] Ex. xiii. 17. He does not lead Israel by the direct route, because of the strength of the Philistines; cf. xiv. 1 ff., xxiii. 29; Num. x. 1, xiv. 41, xxxiii. 2, 38; cf. Lev. i. 1, iv. 1, v. 14, vi. 1, 19, vii. 22, xvii. 1, xx. 1, xxi. 1, xxii. 17, 26; Num. i. 1, ii. 1, iii. 1, 39, 51, iv. 37, 41, 45, 49, etc.

[4] Ex. ix. 16, x. 1, xi. 9; Lev. xviii. 24 f. [5] Josh. ii. 9.

[6] Judg. iii. 1. This whole conception comes out with singular strength, *e.g.* in 2 Sam. xvi. 10, 11, xvii. 14; 1 Sam. xxvi. 12, Gen. xxv. 23 f.; Judg. xiv. 4. In all these stories, what is subjectively experienced as painful, indeed even what cannot be subjectively justified, is, when viewed objectively, woven into the series of God's "doings."

harden; that they mark out beforehand the ways which the people are destined to take. It is an antidote for all human anxieties to hear words like, "Leave Me to care for My people, for the work of My hands."[1] And although ancient Israel may probably have thought of Jehovah only as acting for and in His people, nevertheless the prophets know that God is not guiding Israel's destiny only, but that the history of foreign nations is also His work. The undertakings of Assyria and of Babylon are His achievements. As He brought Israel up out of Egypt, so He brought the Philistines from Caphtor, and the Assyrians from Kir. He gave the Syrians help through Naaman. And the prophecies of His messengers are directed against the other nations of the world as well as against Israel.[2] Hence the whole history of the world, with all its great events, is the work of God.

This influence of God, even upon the inner history of independent beings, is explained by the view which is characteristic of every part of the Old Testament alike, that the Spirit of God is the foundation and condition of all the spiritual life of man. The Spirit of God—that is, the conscious vital force peculiar to God, which, as proceeding from Him, is the power that engenders life, the principle both of creation and of preservation — is not merely the power of physical life which causes the animal continuance of beings possessed of souls. It is, likewise, the power which sustains the personal life of man, and to which are due all supernatural developments in the spiritual life of humanity. It appears to the earlier ages, mainly, as the spirit of prophecy. Thus it rests on Moses, passes over from him almost in a material form to the elders,[3] and, later on, it seizes upon Saul even against his will.[4] But it is also, in

[1] B. J. xlv. 10 ff.; cf. *e.g.* Hos. xiv. 5 f.; Amos ix. 8; Isa. xxii. 11.

[2] Amos ix. 7; Deut. ii. 12, 22; Isa. v. 26 ff., vii. 20, viii. 7, ix. 11, x. 5 ff. xxiii. 9; B. J. xlv. 1; 2 Kings v. 1.

[3] Num. xi. 17–21; cf. Deut. xxxiv. 9.

[4] 1 Sam. x. 6, 9, 11, xi. 6, xix. 20.

a more general sense, the spirit of supramundane wisdom and understanding.[1] As supernatural, holy enthusiasm, and heroic valour, it takes full possession of the Judges, and renders them capable of marvellous daring.[2] It calls into exercise the wisdom of a true king, the gifts of a wise ruler.[3] In short, the Spirit of God works as the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge, and of the fear of the Lord, no less readily than as the spirit of prophecy. The early ages represented its effects in strong and almost materialistic forms. Afterwards these appear in less striking forms of presentation. But, wherever any higher spiritual force and capacity, in no wise explicable as a created force, manifests itself in man, it is the Spirit of God that produces it.[4] Even artists and poets, in their inexplicable technical skill, are "filled with the Spirit of God."[5] The arts of daily life, the discoveries of the human intellect, for instance, good and sensible methods of agriculture, come from God.[6] It is universally true that "there is a spirit in man, and the breath of the Almighty giveth him understanding."[7] Intelligence must be got by prayer to God.[8] And, above all, the mysterious impulses which enable a godly man to lead a life well-pleasing to God, are not regarded as a development of human environment, but are nothing else than "the Spirit of God," which is also called,

[1] Gen. xli. 38; cf. 1 Kings v. 12, x. 24.

[2] Num. xiv. 24; Judg. xi. 29, xiii. 25, xiv. 6, 19, xv. 14; cf. iii. 10, vi. 34; 1 Sam. x. 6, 10, xvi. 13 (צלח על and לבי׳ש). Specially instructive is the combination of sensuality and heroism in Samson, "the Nazirite," to whom this Spirit of God is represented as being communicated, obviously not in a moral sense, but in a purely external way owing to his being a Nazirite.

[3] 1 Sam. xi. 6; 1 Kings iii. 28.

[4] Prov. viii.; Job. xxviii.; Isa. xi. 2; B. J. xlii. 1.

[5] 2 Sam. xxiii. 2; cf. Ex. xxviii. 3, xxxi. 3, 6, xxxv. 31, 35, xxxvi. 1 f. (רוח חכמה, רוח אלהים). On the other hand, the more historical account in 1 Kings vii. 14, says nothing of any special divine inspiration in the artificers employed on the temple of God.

[6] Isa. xxviii. 26, 29 (הפליא עצה).

[7] Job xxxii. 8.

[8] (Ezek. xviii. 31; Hagg. i. 12, 14); Ps. li. 12, 14, cxix. 73, 144, 169.

as being the Spirit peculiarly God's,—His Holy Spirit. When God takes that away from a man, He thereby excludes him from the number of His servants.[1] This whole conception shows us that religious revelation is far from being represented in the Old Testament as a perfectly isolated and unintelligible phenomenon, like the communication of special secrets of knowledge; and that it has, on the contrary, close and vital connection with all the other supernatural domains of spiritual life. The sages of Old Testament life, still subject to the influence of "the true God," are very far from holding the Levitical doctrine of inspiration. They regard inspiration as marvellous enthusiasm, as the filling of an individual with higher than ordinary power.

Owing to this conviction, the Old Testament saints found no real difficulty in a question which in later times caused great searchings of heart. The Spirit of God which is given to a man for a definite purpose, and which is sometimes conceived to be just like an angelic being that seizes hold of a person in quite a naïve materialistic fashion,[2] remains, of course, in the hand of God, and may be used by Him just as the moral conditions or the purposes of the kingdom of God demand. It is taken back again if the vessel prove unsuitable, and is transferred to others, just as the Spirit of God, being the spirit of life, also forsakes any form which can no longer sustain life.[3] In this sense God is the Lord of the spirits of all flesh. Accordingly, the impairing and disordering of the spiritual life of man must also be ascribed to the will of God, who takes away His spirit. Indeed, just as God may allow His spirit to work in a man so as to ennoble his spiritual life, He may also permit it to work so as to disorder and weaken

[1] Ps. li. 13.

[2] 1 Kings xviii. 12; Ezek. viii. 3, xi. 1, xliii. 5 (like "the hand of God," Isa. viii. 11; Ezek. iii. 14, 22).

[3] Judg. xvi. 19 (later 1 Sam. xvi. 13 f.).

that life wherever His righteousness or His purposes of salvation demand it. The Spirit of God is, in itself, only a wonderful power by which the life of man is regulated. It is of course a gracious Spirit, whenever it is conferred by way of a blessing.[1] But in itself there is no direct moral element. It is the Spirit of God that first impels Samson to slay the Philistines, as it impelled him to rend the lion.[2] Thus it is quite easy to believe that God, in order to punish, sends an evil spirit from the Lord, a false spirit.[3] Thus David can imagine that God in His anger is stirring up Saul to persecute the innocent.[4] Hence it can be said that when God wishes to destroy, men "do not hear," that is, are not able to hear;[5] that God hardens by His prophets, in other words, produces an inward hardening against the truth, which must then lead to swift and certain ruin,[6] so that He becomes, to His people, a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence. God hardens by His words and acts, in order to effect the mysterious purposes of His wisdom. The deceived and the deceiver are His. Indeed, the people can pray, "Why dost Thou make us to err from Thy ways, and hardenest our heart from Thy fear?" [7]

5. But, although this question presented no difficulty to the speculative in Israel, manifold complications necessarily arose even for this people out of the relations between

[1] Ps. cxliii. 10.

[2] Judg. xi. 29, xiii. 25, xiv. 6, 19, xv. 14.

[3] Judg. ix. 23; 1 Sam. xvi. 13 ff., xviii. 10, 12, xix. 9; 1 Kings xxii. 21; cf. 2 Sam. xxiv. 1; 1 Kings xii. 15. Certainly, in such cases, we generally have not the Spirit of Jehovah, but a spirit *from* Jehovah or a spirit of Elohim, so that it is the divine influence rather than the connection of such a spirit with the covenant God of Israel that is emphasised. But the difference is not essential, and in 1 Sam. xix. 9, at least, our present text has רוח יהוה רעה.

[4] 1 Sam. xxvi. 19.

[5] 1 Sam. ii. 25.

[6] Ex. vii. 3, xi. 9 (cf. iv. 21, ix. 12, x. 1, 20, 27, xiv. 4, 8, 17 (הקשׁה, חזק) —most strongly in Ex. ix. 16 (C). Very frequently also in the prophetic period, cf. Deut. ii. 30 (where it happens for Israel's good). Isa. vi. 10, xix. 14, xxix. 10 f.; cf. B. J. lxiii. 10 f., lxiv. 5.

[7] Deut. ii. 30, xxix. 3; Josh. xi. 20; Job xii. 16 (20-25), xvii. 4; Isa. viii. 14; Jer. vi. 10; B. J. xliv. 18, lxiii. 17.

human action and divine supremacy. At first, no doubt, in the fresh vigour of faith, these difficulties were overlooked. But they necessarily cropped up anew as soon as men began to think for themselves, and follow their religious principles to their logical conclusions. True, the fundamental question itself as to the relation of free will to divine action is either not raised, or is left unsolved. But religious men are apt to stumble on particular occurrences, which force this question upon their attention in the form of a practical dilemma. Thus the wise in Israel begin to have doubts about religion, and then they make attempts to overcome those doubts.

First of all, the moral sense was of necessity offended by the fact that a man's salvation or non-salvation depended on his belonging to a particular race. For this seemed to leave everything to fate, nothing to a man's own moral freedom; and in the wanton ill-humour of despair the people could exclaim: "The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge." The declaration itself could not, it is true, be denied. The destiny of an individual is connected by a thousand threads with the acts and the circumstances of his forefathers.[1] It is an absolutely undeniable fact; and it is simply due to this, that an individual is not a personality all at once, but becomes so only gradually; and that he cannot be regarded as existing for himself alone, but only as a member of an organism. It is undoubtedly a law of natural development that the sins of the fathers are visited on the children unto the third and the fourth generation. But the difficulty involved in this proposition is overcome by religious thought in the times of Israel's sorest distress, when it presses forward to the belief that this law is not the highest, not the determining one. The final decision as to whether a person is to be saved or lost, depends not on that natural law that each individual belongs to a particular race, but on the moral law that every personal being is able, in spite of

[1] Deut. v. 9; Jer. xxxii. 18 ff.

that natural law, to choose his own personal position. And just as human justice is forbidden by the prophetic law to punish a son for his father's crime,[1] so the prophets since Jeremiah teach that the effect of ancestral guilt or merit is transferred by God to the son only when, by his own personal decision, that son identifies himself with this guilt or this merit—in other words, for every moral being there exists the possibility of overcoming, through the higher law of moral self-determination, the natural law of heredity. No longer shall the proverb hold good in Israel: "The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the sons' teeth are set on edge;" for the son's soul belongs to God as much as the father's does. Every one shall die for his own iniquity.[2]

In the second place, there must be a grievous temptation in the thought that the very God who by His prophets hardens the people has, after that hardening, to pronounce judgment upon them. Here, too, the doctrine of God's hardening influence is neither directly denied nor softened by superficial evasions, such as "permission" or mere "foreknowledge." It is asserted with the utmost distinctness that God has the absolute right to do with His creature as He pleases, without being criticised by man. Nor does any one doubt that it is an effect intended by God, when, at a certain stage in sin, His revelation makes the heart harder. God's word can never return unto Him void. Where it is hindered from blessing, it must curse. Light must make weak eyes weaker; nourishing food must aggravate the virulence of disease. This is a necessary moral ordinance,—in other words, one willed by God from eternity.[3] Thus every prophet who has to work in an age of incurable depravity must fulfil this ordinance, must by His word of truth make deaf ears deafer and blind eyes blinder. Hence God makes even the wicked for the day of evil, just as He makes everything for His own

[1] Deut. xxiv. 16; 2 Kings xiv. 6. [2] Jer. xxxi. 29 f.; Ezek. xviii. 2 ff.
[3] Isa. vi. 9 ff.; B. J. lv. 11.

purposes.[1] But, from a moral standpoint, this fact may also be represented as the result of the people's already incurable moral obliquity,—in other words, as a well-merited judgment which God righteously inflicts upon His people. God sends His prophets. But the people "see not with their eyes nor hear with their ears."[2] Consequently their obduracy is already the beginning of condign chastisement. With the upright God shows Himself upright; but with the perverse He shows Himself perverse. Every one ought to murmur against his own sin, not against God.[3]

But there is a third difficulty which the best of the people must have found the most perplexing. If free will is no barrier to the accomplishment of God's will, if therefore whatever happens is the expression of His will, and He is just and good, then every event must be in harmony with the principles of morality; and whatever befalls an individual or a people must accord with their attitude to religion and morality. Hence objection could be raised to the very existence of evil, to the circumstance that God creates evil of which all get a share.[4] Still the pious can, with comparative ease, get over this difficulty, partly by the thought that the arrangements of this world are incomprehensible, and, partly by their sense of personal sinfulness, and the consciousness that even the best are not perfect. But what might with all the greater certainty be expected is surely this—that, taking this universality of human evil for granted, at least special and extraordinary misfortune should befall only those who have given special offence to God; and that the pious, although liable to the ordinary ills of human existence, should nevertheless be able to calculate on remaining unmolested and happy within the limits of average experience.

[1] Prov. xvi. 4.

[2] Ezek. xii. 2; cf. also Ex. vii. 13, 22, viii. 15, with viii. 32 and ix. 34 (1 Sam. vi. 6).

[3] Ps. xviii. 26; Lam. iii. 39.

[4] Amos iii. 6; Micah i. 12; Lam. iii. 38; B. J. xlv. 7.

Such is in fact the theory on which the history of Israel is written. An exaggerated form of it is the view of the chronicler that the people's happiness or misery was unalterably determined by its attitude to the statutes and laws of the priestly Thorah. But when the lot of the people and its individual members was examined with a keener eye, and without false humility, this belief in its simple naïve form could not pass uncontested. The ungodly were seen to flourish and continue prosperous to the day of their death; the best had to endure the most bitter affliction. A Josiah perished by the sword; a Jeremiah was crushed beneath a thousand woes; and sorrow-stricken psalmists prayed in vain to be delivered from the injustice and oppression of the great. At the very time Israel seemed most anxious to press toward the goal, when it might have almost felt itself righteous in regard to its God, it was trampled down all the more.[1] In a word, evil appeared to come purely from a law of nature, absolutely irrespective of moral order.

This observation necessarily met at first with a persistent denial from the really pious. Destiny must accord with righteousness. To the sufferer who maintains he is innocent, his friends exclaim:

> "Shall the earth be made desolate for thee,
> Or shall the rock be removed out of its place?"[2]

Misery must be due to guilt,—

> "For affliction cometh not forth of the dust,
> Neither doth trouble spring out of the ground;
> But man is born unto trouble,
> As the sons of flame fly upward."[3]

And when it is impossible to deny the contradiction between

[1] Jer. xii. 1 ff.; Job xxi. 7–end; Ps. xxii. 2 f., lxxiii. 2; cf. xliv. 18, 21. In Habakkuk, too, we find this feeling very strongly expressed.

[2] Job xviii. 4.

[3] Job v. 6.

destiny and moral worth, the difficulty is solved by hope. Thus it is the constantly recurring thought of Job's friends that his suffering, if he only continue upright, will quickly give place to great happiness, and that all the apparent happiness of the wicked must come to a terrible end.[1] In like manner the thought re-echoes from many passages in the Psalms and the Prophets, that the present contradiction of the law of moral retribution is only apparent and transient. The true Israel will rise again in new glory and blessedness. The wicked, seemingly so happy, will be overtaken by sudden misfortune, and sink into Sheol like cattle. The suffering saints will be rescued and crowned with victory; in glory and joy they will witness the overthrow of the wicked.[2] Thus in all the confidence and assurance of faith the old declaration is reasserted:

> "I have been young, and now am old;
> Yet have I not seen the righteous forsaken,
> Nor his seed begging bread."[3]

And in answer to the complaints and murmurings as to the misery imposed by God it is said, in tones of earnest rebuke, "Wherefore doth a living man complain? Let each mourn over his own sins." "How dare the clay contend with the potter,—a potsherd among potsherds of earth!"[4]

But such an answer cannot be decisive. It is only after a great struggle that even Jeremiah can retain his belief in it.[5] Hope could only have been regarded as a true solution of this difficulty, and one not contradicted by experience, had the doctrine of a future and eternal retribution, equally certain to happen to all, been taught with perfect clearness;

[1] Job v. 3, 18–27, viii. 4, 13 ff., 20, iv. 8 ff., xi. 20, xv. 20 ff., xviii. 5 ff., xx. 4–end (xxxiv. 11, xxxvi. 5). Imitated ironically xxiv. 18 ff., xxvii. 13 ff.

[2] Habak. i. 2 ff., 13, iii. 13; Ps. xxii. 23 ff., xlii. 6, 12, xliii. 5, xlix. 6, 15, 17 ff., xxxvii. 9, 29, lxiv. 8 ff., lxix. 31 f., l. 21, lxxiii. 17–21, lxxv. 9, xci. 8, xciv. 23, xcii. 8, 10, 13, cxii., cxxviii., cxl. 9 ff., cxlv. 18 ff.

[3] Ps. xxxvii. 25.

[4] Lam. iii. 39; Isa. xxix. 16; B. J. xlv. 9, 11.

[5] Jer. xii. 1 ff.

and not merely taught, but accepted by the godly as the innermost conviction of their souls. But since that was certainly not the case, as we shall show later on; since the thought of future retribution sprang up only here and there, and more in the form of passionately excited feeling than of clear conviction, and that, too, only at a very late stage, the stern reality had soon to laugh to scorn the consolation for the contradictions of the present, which simple piety wished to find in hope. A people may rise again into new prosperity. But what compensation has an individual who has perished in misery? The prosperity of one's descendants may balance the injustice of one's own lot. But what good does that do to the dead?[1] The sudden ruin of a wicked people may balance its former undeserved happiness. But when a wealthy wicked man, after a life of uninterrupted prosperity, dies quietly in a good old age, and goes down to Sheol, the house appointed for all living, what punishment befalls him?

It is from realising this truth in its bitter nakedness, and maintaining it firmly against all foolish suggestions, that the suffering undergone was only insignificant and transient, that the book of Job gets its chief importance. This patient sufferer knows from experience how false, and even how fatal, the conviction may in individual cases be, that a man's lot is proof of his moral worth. In bitter irony he follows out the wise applications of the dictum:

> "In the thought of him who is at ease
> There is contempt for misfortune;
> It is ready for them whose foot slippeth. . . .
> Upright men shall be astonied at this,
> And the innocent shall stir himself up against the godless.
> Yet shall the righteous hold on his way,
> And he that hath clean hands shall wax stronger and stronger."[2]

---

[1] Job xxi. 19–21.

[2] Job xii. 5, xvii. 8 f. The problem in all its harshness, *e.g.* ix. 22, iii. 20, x. 3, 18, vi. 2 ff., xvi. 11, 17, xvii. 2, xix. 6–23, xxi. 7–end, xiii. 10 ff., xxiv. 23 ff., xxvii. 2.

The trial of Job turns just on this, that God wishes to test the strength of the sufferer's faith, and see whether he is able still to retain his belief in the righteousness of God when he is no longer conscious of any material sign thereof; and Satan hopes by this affliction to make Job doubt God, and turn him into an unbeliever. Now in this book the problem is solved by action. Job continues faithful, after having struggled through all the sloughs of temptation. And God does His injured servant full justice by crowning his patience, and giving him abundant compensation. But the real difficulty is not touched. The one-sided idea that suffering is penal is not overcome, either by a clear view of future reward, or by an acknowledgment of a higher suffering on the part of the innocent, which the counsel of God alone can explain. At the most, the value of suffering as a test is brought prominently forward. The main thing for the poet is that, in view of the divine wisdom, manifested in the problems of nature, Job has to acknowledge that it would be foolish presumption, were he to insist on measuring God's ways and acts by the standard of his own human thought.

Nevertheless the thoughts that really solve the problem are already found in the Old Testament. The book of Job itself had at least made it permanently clear that severe sufferings are not always to be regarded as the messengers of divine wrath, but may also be a test of God's favour, the object of which is salvation, not destruction; and that therefore the righteousness of God is not to be judged by every passing circumstance. But the speeches of Elihu, which form an appendix to the book, insist, with great distinctness, that such suffering is to be understood as a discipline intended to save from pride and presumption, which might otherwise lead to destruction. He remembers the visions and dreams by which the patient sufferer is instructed, and he works up a picture of successful discipline, much the same as that which the chronicler in his narrative gives

of Manasseh's misery and conversion.[1] And in the Prophets, Psalms, and Proverbs, we constantly meet with the idea of a discipline which saves from the day of misfortune, and which it is a blessing to undergo.[2]

We are then carried further by the hope which, after the Exile, grows stronger and stronger, of an actual victory over death even for the individual, a hope which affords an easy and happy solution of all the enigmas of this life. But the thought that goes furthest is that of a suffering, the worth of which is absolute,—a suffering which, according to the secret counsel of divine love, the best endure in order to accomplish the gracious purposes of God,—a substitutionary suffering in which they offer themselves as a sacrifice to blot out the sins of their people, and make possible for the world a higher salvation. By the thought of such a suffering all those doubts are solved which could not but be started by the suffering of the innocent.[3]

Of scepticism proper, scepticism as to the actual existence of an enduring moral good and of a supernatural world, the prophetic period knew nothing. Occasionally, indeed, the words used in the book of Job to describe the soul's bitterest struggles, point towards this abyss; but Job himself never comes near it. So long as the spirit of the old religion was still alive in full prophetic strength and vigour, its adherents, that is, all who did not turn away from it in materialistic unbelief, could not possibly indulge in any such general scepticism regarding religion.[4] It is only in Ecclesiastes that the scepticism of the latest Old Testament period takes up this ground.

[1] Job xxxiii. 15–29, xxxvi. 8 ff. (2 Chron. xxxiii. 11 ff.).

[2] Deut. viii. 2 (the sufferings of the wilderness journey as a means of discipline); Hos. ii. 8 ff., 11 ff., v. 2; Jer. xxxv. 13; B. J. xxvii. 8; Ps. lxvi. 10, xciv. 12; Lam. iii. 27–30 (תוכיח מוסר).

[3] B. J. liii.

[4] Such doubt appears to the believer "brutalising" (Ps. lxxiii. 22).

CHAPTER XI.

THE ANGELS.

LITERATURE.—Gramberg, "Grundzüge einer Engellehre des Alten Testamentes (*Winer wissenschaftl. Zeitschr.* ii. 157 ff.). W. H. Kosters (*Theol. Tijdschr.* ix. 1875) "De Mal'ach Jahve (x. 1876, 34 ff., 113 ff.) het onstan en de ontwickkeling der angelologie onder Israel (xiii. 1879, 445 ff.) de Cherubim." A. Kohut, *Ueber die jüdische Angelologie und Dämonologie in ihrer Abhängigkeit vom Parsismus.* Ch. F. Trip, *Die Theophanien in den Geschichtsbüchern des Alten Testamentes.* Leiden 1858. Ode, *Commentarius de angelis,* 1739. Steinwerder, *Christus Deus in Vet. Test. libris historicis.* Schelling, *Ges. Werke,* Abth. ii. Bd. iv. 128 f. Hengstenberg, *l.c.*, Chr. G. Barth, *Der Engel des Bundes. Ein Beitrag zur Christologie.* Leipz. 1845. Spencer, *l.c.*, 1084–1188. Züllig, *Der Cherubimwagen.* Heidelb. 1832. Lämmert, "Die Cherubim der heiligen Schrift" (*Jahrbb. f. deutsche Theol.* 1867, 4, 589 ff.). Riehm, *De natura et notione symbolica Cheruborum,* Bas. et Lugd. 1864) "Die Cherubim in der Stiftshütte und im Tempel" (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1874, 3, 399 ff.). Bähr, *l.c.*, i. 312 f. Kamphausen (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1864, 4, 712 ff.). Kahnis, *De Angelo Domini diatribe,* Lips. 1858, 4. Steudel, *Veterisne Testamenti libris insit notio manifesti ab occulto distinguendi numinis,* Tub. 1838.

1. As far back as we can look in the Old Testament, we meet with the idea of superhuman beings, who stand to God in a relation of kinship, but are inferior to Him in power. Indeed, this idea is everywhere regarded as so self-evident that it does not require to be in any way insisted on in teaching. Sacred legend, as given in B and C, is fond of introducing the angel of God, wherever there is any question of special displays of divine power or providence. Frag-

ments like Gen. vi. 1–3, songs like Ps. xxix., ancient stories like Ex. xxiii. 20, speak of Elohim and sons of Elohim; and angels are constantly appearing in the history of Moses and Joshua, and all through the earliest legends about the Judges.[1] Thus, such beings are everywhere taken for granted as objects of popular faith. As to the original character of a popular view so ancient as this, we cannot, of course, do more than form an opinion that approximates to probability. But when we examine the oldest passages in which such angelic beings are mentioned, the conviction is forced upon us that two quite distinct views regarding them have been combined. On the one hand, we meet with beings which, along with the covenant God of Israel, are represented as Elohim, mighty beings of the same class as He is, quite above the natural and moral laws that govern material beings. It is reasonable to suppose that these represent the gods of the old Semitic religion, who have shrivelled up into subordinate heavenly beings. On the other hand, we find in the Malach Jahve a living revelation and manifestation of this covenant God Himself, as if it were a mere question of one form of His activity. These two views must be separately considered.

2. The Elohim, of whom the oldest writings of the Old Testament speak, when they mean to indicate neither the God of Israel nor expressly mentioned gods of other peoples, are evidently personal spiritual beings, possessed of great power, and contrasted with material beings, subject to the laws of Nature. Of such Elohim God speaks when He says, "Behold the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil."[2] It is to them that the popular phrase refers which describes oil and wine as gifts, which cheer both gods and men.[3] In Psalms lviii. and lxxxii., unless these

[1] Num. xx. 16; Josh. v. 13; cf. Judg. vi. 11 ff., xiii. 3 ff. [2] Gen. iii. 22.
[3] Judg. ix. 8–15. Kosters would refer this directly to sacrificial offerings acceptable to the Elohim, and hence he explains that the same expression is

songs means to speak of men in a highly poetical fashion, they are represented as "an assembly of gods," in which, with words of censure and reprimand, God appears as king, to call them to account for having superintended, in an unjust and careless manner, the destinies of the peoples entrusted to their care. They are more accurately described as "sons of God,"[1] not, indeed, in the physical sense "begotten of God," or even in the moral sense, "inwardly akin to Him through piety and goodness," but as "individual beings who belong to the same class, of which the full and highest development is God Himself."[2] Consequently, in the poetic diction of the pre-exilic age, and later, they are represented as "God's holy ones,"[3] His heroes, His army,[4] His myriads.[5] They fill His heavenly palace,[6] assemble before His throne to do obeisance to Him, and give an account of their stewardship.[7] On the other hand, they are not bound by the laws of morality, and they interfere in a very high-handed manner with human affairs.[8]

From the way in which these Elohim are spoken of, it can scarcely be doubted that they are the nature-spirits of the old Semitic heathenism. The divine beings which were thought of as near the Most High God and in attendance on Him, which were represented as not in themselves subject to the moral law, nor absolutely dependent on Jehovah, did not of course disappear from the popular imagination as religion became purer. But they ceased to be of importance in religion

not used of the fig, which is not employed as an offering. But even oil is not offered by itself as an article of sacrifice. It is much more natural to think of articles of food actually enjoyed by the Elohim, as the realism of antiquity had certainly no difficulty in doing. This view is supported also by Ps. lxxviii. 25, where manna, the bread of heaven, is described as "the food of the mighty," *i.e.* not as an offering, but as the food of the heavenly beings (cf. Zech. xii. 8).

[1] בני־אלהים and בני־אלים.

[2] Cf. in general the meaning of בן in the Hebrew language (son of the dawn, son of the bow, etc.).

[3] Deut. xxxiii. 2; Zech. xiv. 5; Ps. lxxxix. 8.

[4] Ps. ciii. 20 ff.; 1 Kings xxii. 19.

[5] Deut. xxxiii. 2.

[6] Ps. xxix. 1, 9, lxxxix. 6 ff.

[7] Job i. 6, ii. 1 (Ps. lviii., lxxxii.).

[8] Gen. vi. 1–3.

itself, and to claim either reverence or adoration. It was quite natural that the conception of such beings should develop as easily in the direction of opposing God as in that of serving Jehovah. The first case is dealt with in chap. xiv. Here we are concerned only with the second. We need not, with Kosters, think primarily of the gods of other peoples. That is only a later development of the thought. It was rather a question as to the divine beings which had formerly been worshipped by the Hebrew people itself. And it may well have been the case that, even in primitive days, these beings were identified with the stars, which as living powers rule over the earth in wonderful majesty and order.[1] These "sons of the gods" are in themselves of no importance for the religion or morality of Israel. God is greater than they; indeed, in comparison with Him,[2] they become more and more mere nonentities. At the most, the fact of a heathen world was explained by a later age as due to Jehovah having given these beings,—the host of heaven,—charge over the nations of the world while He reserved Israel for Himself.[3] Otherwise they are thought of as God's retinue. They perfect the impression of His glory, increase His splendour as heroes and men of might, and make His warlike prowess manifest. That they must finally become His servants and messengers is self-evident. But that the Elohim and the Malachim are exactly the same is nowhere stated in the Old Testament.[4] And in passages like Gen. vi., the old sensuous character of these beings, who are indifferent

[1] Job xxxviii. 7; B. J. xlv. 12; cf. Job xxv. 2, xxxviii. 31.

[2] Ex. xv. 11, xviii. 11; cf. Ps. lxxvii. 14, lxxxvi. 8, xcvi. 4, 5, xcvii. 7, 9.

[3] Deut. iv. 19, xxix. 25, xxxii. 8, 9. With this is connected the arraignment of the gods in Ps. lviii. and lxxxii., and of the host of heaven in B. J. xxiv. 21; cf. xiv. 12. The way in which Hebrew poetry speaks of Leviathan, the fleeing serpent, "the fool," etc., points to an old mythological notion, to the battles of the Deity with hostile powers of nature. (Ezek. xxix. 3, xxxii. 2, 3; Ps. lxxiv. 13; B. J. xiii. 10, xxvii. 1; Jer. li. 34; Job iii. 8, ix. 9, xxvi. 13, xxxviii. 31; Amos v. 8).

[4] Indirectly, perhaps, since the expression used in Gen. iii. and Ps. viii. of the Elohim is applied to the "Malach Jahve" (1 Sam. xxix. 9; 2 Sam. xiv. 17, 20, xix. 38).

to moral goodness, has such prominence given to it that we cannot wonder that their transformation into "angels" was not effected without leaving a residuum, which necessarily gave rise to the thought of impious but powerful beings who rebelled against the ordinances and the purposes of God.

3. The angelology of Judaism is more directly connected with the conception of the "Malach Jahve." It has recently been asserted that where the word Malach occurs before the Exile, it invariably means a terrestrial manifestation of God Himself, which, as a form of manifestation or revelation is, of course, to be distinguished from Jehovah as the king of Heaven, who sends it.[1] This must unquestionably be described as an exaggeration of an idea that is so far correct. An examination of Genesis, chaps. xviii., xix., and xxviii., is sufficient to confute it. For that the three figures which Abraham sees do not represent the One Jehovah is evident from the fact that two of them go on to Sodom, while the third, the proper manifestation of Jehovah—who does not wish to mix Himself up with the sin and shame of Sodom—remains behind with Abraham, and thereafter sends the judgment down from Heaven. And the Malachim which, according to C, Jacob sees ascending and descending on the ladder that reaches to Heaven, are not identical with Jehovah who, according to B, becomes visible to the sleeper in his dream, but are simply the servants of God, who inhabit His palace and carry out His behests on the earth. Hence, even the early legends of Israel know of Malachim, who are not a manifestation of Jehovah Himself, but are simply servants that do His commandments.[2] But this does not lessen the accuracy of the

[1] Kosters; Wellhausen, *Gesch. Isr.* i. 355, is right in recognising that in C, Malachim, in the plural, are in the retinue of Jehovah and his means of communication with the earth (Gen. xxviii., xxxii.).

[2] The arbitrary character of Kosters' hypothesis is made specially clear by passages like Josh. v. 13 ff., צבא יהוה; or 2 Sam. xiv. 17, xix. 28; 1 Sam. xxix. 9. On the other hand, the remark is true that the more transcendental the conception of God becomes, the more shadowy does the whole conception of "the angel of God" become, the idea of mere "servants" or

observation that early legend often speaks of the Malach Jahve in such a way that his appearance and speech are equivalent to an appearance and speech of Jehovah. These passages, moreover, give one the impression that this is the original view. It is, indeed, so marked a characteristic that a considerable portion of the early Church saw in this angel of God the personal Logos Himself—*i.e.* the self-revealing God who here presents us with a type of "the Incarnation." And this view, in which there is undeniably an element of truth, has been in modern times defended, with more or less skill, by Schelling, Barth, Kahnis, Steinwender, Hengstenberg, and Stier.

In order not to miss the real import of this ancient view, we shall, in the first instance, set aside all the passages in which it is either probable or possible that a Malach Jahve is spoken of who is expressly distinguished from a revelation of God, and is conceived of merely as the bearer of a single commission, or of a special divine communication. This applies not merely to such passages as 1 Kings xix. 5, 7, 2 Kings i. 15, where the angel of God is clearly distinguished from the subsequent manifestation of God; or 2 Sam. xxiv. 15 ff., 2 Kings xix. 35, 1 Chron. xxi. 15 ff., where the angel of the plague is nothing but a servant of God; or Ps. xxxiv. 8, xxxv. 5, 6, Gen. xxiv. 7, Mal. iii. 1, where the singular is purely accidental, as is shown by comparison of Ps. xci. 11, Gen. xxviii. 12, xxxii. 2, and where the whole emphasis lies on the service done to the pious; or 1 Sam. xxix. 9, 2 Sam. xiv. 17, 20, xix. 28, where the popular proverbs evidently mean to indicate a class of beings which are indeed higher than man, but not identical with God.[1] But even passages are to be passed over, such as those in the account of the Exodus by B and C, where the Malach Jahve

"messengers" taking its place. This reaches a climax in Mohammedanism, where even the Holy Spirit becomes "an Angel."

[1] In such passages, where there is no reference to an earthly manifestation of God, what would be the meaning of the addition "Malach," if one merely meant to say "wise and gracious as God"?

is probably spoken of in the fuller sense of the word. For an angel in whom "God's name is"[1] and whose holy wrath must punish the sins of the people, is, of course, in a certain sense, one with God; and when, in B, "the face of God" goes before Israel[2] as a sign that God is reconciled, the meaning undoubtedly is that God Himself has returned to His people and is present among them.[3] And when Zechariah[4] and Deutero-Isaiah,[5] allude to these narratives, they rightly make God and His angel stand in parallelism with one another. But even here expressions—such as Ex. xxiii. 20, 23, xxxiii. 2 f., Num. xx. 16—make the matter doubtful, at least for C; and it might be enough to think of an ambassador of God who, as the representative of his heavenly King, is clothed with His authority. In the same way Zech. iii. 1 ff., where the angel of God might be regarded as identical with the self-revealing God, is rendered uncertain by i. 12. We confine ourselves, therefore, to the undisputed passages, which all belong to the ancient kernel of the book of Judges, and to sacred legend as given by B and C, and are consequently part of the original elements of Israel's national faith.

In all these passages, where it is stated that the angel of God appeared and spoke, it is also assumed, without further explanation, that the personal covenant God Himself appeared and spoke.[6] The angel of God appears in human form. He also speaks of Jehovah as of a third person—a person distinct from himself. He is, no doubt, clearly distinguished from

[1] בקרבו, Ex. xxiii. 20 f. (C).

[2] פני, Ex. xxxiii. 14 (B), (xxxii. 34); cf. Deut. iv. 37. This "face" is the holy presence of God Himself (Ex. xxxiii. 20). The Phœnicians and the Babylonians conceived of "the face" and "the name" of the Deity as just a new female form of divine manifestation. For the meaning of "the face of God" as His self-revealing presence, cf. Num. vi. 25, Ps. xxi. 7, cxxxix. 7, etc.

[3] Expressly so in Ex. xxxiv. 9.

[4] Zech. xii. 8.

[5] B. J. lxiii. 9: "In all their affliction He was afflicted, and the angel of His presence saved them."

[6] So Gen. xvi. 7 ff., xxi. 17, xxii. 11, 14, 15, xxxi. 11, 13; Ex. iii. 2 ff.; Judg. ii. 1, 4, vi. 11–24, xiii. 3–22.

Jehovah.[1] But those who see him fear they must die, are conscious that they have seen God Himself, and mark the spots where these manifestations took place, as places where God made Himself manifest. Jacob speaks of the Malach Jahve who accompanied him and shielded him all through life,[2] while the narrative itself knows only of God's personal intercourse with him. The Song of Deborah makes "the angel of God" pronounce a curse upon Meroz,[3] while the curse itself is called a "word from God." And the Elohim with whom, according to Genesis, Jacob wrestled, is called by Hosea the Malach.[4]

The simplest explanation of this fact is evidently this, that Malach Jahve just denotes a theophany, or, as Hitzig expresses it, "God, working at a concrete spot, and at a definite point of time, is called the angel of God."[5] It is further pointed out that Malach originally means not "messenger," but "message," "commission." Naturally, even in this explanation, a distinction must be drawn between God who is the subject of this manifestation, and in relation to it, always remains "the Heavenly One," and the form of manifestation in which His "name," His "countenance," or His "glory" dwells, as in the Temple, the pillar of fire, and the burning bush. But this manifested form is never thought of as a heavenly being used by God for this purpose, but as an earthly, movable, changeable figure, which has no independent significance of any kind.

I do not mean to deny the high degree of probability which this view possesses. It is in fact undeniable that the form in which God thus appears is, as form, a matter of pure indifference to the narrator, that absolutely no emphasis is laid on the special personality of the angel, but that everything depends on God who is thus revealing Himself. Still I cannot convince myself that the view itself is correct. The

[1] Gen. xvi. 5, 9 ff. ; Num. xxii. 22 ff.
[2] Gen. xlviii. 16.
[3] Judg. v. 23.
[4] Hos. xii. 5 (cf. Zech. xii. 8).
[5] So Vatke, de Wette, Reuss, Bertheau, Wellhausen, Kosters, etc.

very word is sufficient to prevent this. I do not indeed doubt that the abstract meaning of it is the fundamental one. But the verb denotes "a sending, a doing of service." For a person employed by God in His service, this is undoubtedly a most appropriate term. But how should the fact that God Himself becomes visible and shows Himself in action be described as "a sending of God," and not as a "manifestation" or a "working of God." Hence, unless one resolves with Kosters to consider, as theophanies, all pre-exilic passages that speak of a Malach, it appears to me inconceivable that in contemporary writers, and indeed in the same documents, the old Hebrew language should have used one and the same word to describe a theophany and a supramundane person distinct from God. And it is certainly a most artificial theory of Kosters that the very Malach Jahve, who was originally meant to explain how Jehovah could become visible without destroying the person who saw Him, should himself become a being who is invisible to men, or a sight of whom kills them.[1] For in that case we must assume a radical change in the original purpose, while both views occur in writings which, like B, C, and the main document in the book of Judges, do not in any way indicate different phases of Israel's religious development. Hence it seems to me necessary to put the term into a wider category. Wherever God wishes to reveal Himself, He requires a self-revealing form, which men can comprehend and endure. Where He wishes merely to give an impression of His presence, sacred symbols or natural phenomena through which His glory shines are sufficient.[2] But when He wishes to communicate His will for the purpose of making men conscious of it, He requires the revealing form to be a person who thinks and speaks. He reveals Himself through "angels." Now, just as the single spiritual

[1] As Gen. xvi. 13; Num. xxii. 31; Judg. vi. 22, xiii. 22.
[2] 1 Kings xxii.

acts of God are conceived of as spirits,[1] while the whole working of God is represented as His Spirit, in like manner, while the various sides of the divine will find expression through angels, the "angel of God" is he in whom God makes known to man, for special ends, His whole being and will. The form of manifestation here also is a personal being, who is not God. But what this being is, is of absolutely no consequence. Whether he has a special personal consciousness and will, or whether he has a definite rank or a special name, are matters of no importance to those who receive the revelation. For them he is merely a form of divine revelation; his words are God's words; to look on him is to look on God.

Hence this angel of God is of great importance, not indeed for "the inner life of God," but certainly for His revelation. While in the Asiatic religions of nature the revealed form of the deity develops into a new and distinct deity,[2] in the religion of the Old Testament, God, although revealed, remains unique. Nevertheless his revelation becomes an actual and real entrance of God into the world of phenomena. The revelation, which the creature receives and which it is capable of understanding and bearing, is really a revelation of God Himself. Yet the God who effects it still remains the God who hides Himself and on whom the creature cannot look. Thus there is undoubtedly in the angel of God something of that which Christian theology means to express by the doctrine of the Logos. Only the self-revealing life of God is not yet human, nor does it yet exist as a permanent personal life.

4. The idea of God being revealed in His angel or angels,

[1] Shechina, Bath-Qol, Kebod-Jahve.

[2] The Taanit as Pen-Baal, the Astarte as Shem-Baal. We may also remind the reader of Baal-Melkarth. Cf. Ps. cxxxix. 7. The Spirit and Face of God (Schlottmann, *Die Inschrift des Eschmunazar*, pp. 75, 142. Fr. Lenormant, *La légende de Semiramis, mémoire présenté à la classe des lettres de l'Academie*, Jan. 8, 1872). (But cf., on the other hand, Dillmann, *Comment. z. Gen.* p. 470.)

combined with a belief in beings of superhuman power but subject to Jehovah, furnishes the material out of which angelology, especially after Ezekiel's time, takes definite form. Its religious significance is, of course, exclusively due to its giving visibility to the working of God in Providence. The angels reveal the will of God for the present and the future, give His servants their life-work, deliver the pious, and execute the divine judgments. The earlier ages, indeed, are very far from seeing in them mere allegories of divine providence or of the forces of nature. Still their own personality as distinct from the will of God, whose agents they are, is a matter of absolute indifference. They stand round about God and serve Him, celebrate His praises, execute His commands, and accompany Him as His troops of attendant horsemen.[1]

For the earlier prophecy, angels are not a condition of revelation. As bearers of God's spirit and word, the prophets are directly inspired by God. The angels are merely the intermediaries of God's action, His manifestation, so that they present almost the appearance of mere metaphors. But the more transcendental the conception of God becomes, the more important even for prophecy do such intermediaries become.[2] They are no longer conceived of as living and active, like "the angel of God" in the olden days, but as individual bearers of individual communications from God to His servants. This is quite in keeping with the growing tendency to hypostatise the Word and the Spirit as distinct from their possessors.[3] Thus in Ezekiel the spirit is an angel;[4] and the prophet who wrote Zech. i.–viii.[5] gets his revelation transmitted and explained to him by angels, just as if they were special human messengers.

[1] Ps. xxxiv. 8, xxxv. 5 f., lxviii. 18, cxlviii. 1 ff.; 2 Kings ii. 11, vi. 17, xix. 35; Isa. xxxvii. 36.

[2] *E.g.* 1 Kings xiii. 18, xix. 5–7, etc.

[3] B. J. xl. 12 ff., lxiii. 10, xlviii. 16; Gen. i. 2; cf. Zech. ii. 7, iii. 4.

[4] Ezek. ii. 2, iii. 12, 14, 24, viii. 3, ix. 1, 5, xxxvii. 1, xliii. 5, xl. 2 f. (ix. 1–x. 7).

[5] Zech. i. 9–14, ii. 2–7, iii. 1, 5 ff., iv. 1, 4, v. 5, 10, vi. 4.

In Daniel, God Himself is quite dumb, and His angel explains the visions to the seer.[1] From this, on the other hand, we easily understand how some of the later Israelitish writings show a disinclination to employ this idea of "revealing intermediaries." To the scribes and the priests "Scripture" is the revelation of God; and they dislike the thought of a "continuing revelation." This tendency, which comes to maturity in Sadducæism, is already visible in a few passages of the Old Testament.[2] The real power of religion, however, was on the side of angelology becoming more and more vivid and varied.[3]

5. Since the conceptions of the Israelitish people as to angels are composed of such elements, it cannot surprise us that they are in themselves of a very indefinite and fluid character. The "nature-spirits" of the old Semites have nothing to do with moral and religious limitations. They must not be regarded as equal to the one God, and yet are to be raised high above the level of human power and knowledge.[4] The being through whom God is revealed shares in the veneration due to God, but is nevertheless distinct from Him, and is not conceived of as purely spiritual but as capable, to a certain extent, of bodily acts. Thus the angels of God eat and drink,—in this, it is true, not differing much from God Himself. They are represented as men of reverend appearance to whom hospitality is offered,[5] or as men of war.[6] Even in Ezekiel they are still assigned a human form.[7] And when they appear to men, they are never in the

[1] Dan. iii. 25; cf. viii. 16, ix. 21, x. 20.

[2] Sirach does not expect any appearances of angels in his day. The chronicler rarely employs angels, however much importance he attaches to the idea of Satan. Even A does not speak of angels (Neh. ix. 20). The priest and the prophet are themselves Malachim of God (Mal. iii. 1; Hagg. i. 13; B. J. xlii. 19).

[3] Cf. *infra*.

[4] Gen. vi. 1–3; cf. Gen. iii. 5, 22; 1 Sam. xxix. 9; 2 Sam. xiv. 17 ff., xix. 28.

[5] Gen. xviii. 8, xix. 3; Judg. vi. 11–23, xiii. 6 ff.

[6] Josh. v. 13 (2 Sam. xxiv. 17).

[7] Ezek. ix. 2; xliii. 6.

earlier days thought of as winged beings. Indeed it is by a ladder that they ascend into heaven.[1] It is only in later times that they are represented as standing between heaven and earth, that is, as hovering on wings.[2] But they are always regarded as exempt from the burdens and limitations of earthly existence, in quite a different way from human beings. They appear to men whenever they please. They are beheld as "the camp of God," as "horses and chariots of fire"—that is, as formed of the most spiritual heavenly element.[3] The angel of God in Judg. vi. refuses human food with disdain, and demands a "burnt-offering" for God; and the imitation of this in Judg. xiii. represents him as in need of nothing. In the story of Balaam, the angel of God stands with drawn sword before the prophet, without being observed by him; while the animal becomes aware of his presence, and naturally shows signs of terror.[4] The angels are thought of as "spirits," identical, as it seems, with the spirit that proceeds from God.[5]

Hence we may easily understand, without further explanation, that these beings, as Elohim, are thought of as without a moral standard. In Genesis vi. it is only mankind that is condemned for having overstepped its bounds, whilst "the sons of the gods," as "superior" beings, do what they please

[1] Gen. xxviii.

[2] 1 Chron. xxi. 16, 27; cf., on the other hand, 2 Sam. xxiv. 16. Zech. v. 9 treats of winged creatures of a symbolic character; Dan. ix. 21 should be translated "gleaming in splendour." On the other hand, it is quite conceivable that the human form was regarded merely as the form in which these beings appeared to men, and that the Elohim had a different form assigned to them in God's heavenly palace. On this point one must decide in conformity with Isa. vi.

[3] Gen. xxi. 17, xxxii. 2 f.; cf. 2 Kings ii. 11, vi. 17.

[4] Num. xxii. 23–27; cf. *Odyss.* xvi. 161 f.

[5] 1 Kings xxii. 21. This is Ezekiel's favourite expression, and while it, too, may in a few passages like iii. 12, 14, xliii. 5, be understood of perfectly impersonal acts of God, still it is clear from xliii. 6 that these "spirits" are thought of as men, as persons. Moreover, the word certainly does not prevent a very concrete and sensuous conception of the actions of these beings (viii. 2 f., xi. 24).

and are not punished as fallen angels in the way later theosophy dreams of.[1] And yet as superhuman beings, nearly akin to God and revealing Him to men, they are believed to be "wise and gracious," as men would like to be and should be.[2] Hence they are called God's "holy ones," that is, are specially dedicated to His service.[3] Accordingly, the idea is occasionally found that although not pure and perfect, as compared with God,[4] they may nevertheless as servants,[5] standing near to Him, intercede for their inferiors, the children of earth, and in this way obtain a certain religious importance.[5] But this conception remains quite isolated. Men are very expressly forbidden to make the angels, as distinguished from God Himself, objects of worship, in the sense, that is, of "the host of heaven,[6]—while, of course, "The Angel of God" is, in the old popular narrative taken for God Himself.[7]

How little this whole conception has been worked out, in the sense of being made a constituent part of a doctrinal system, is rendered particularly clear by the fact that there is nowhere any statement as to "the angels" being created. To the Elohim and the B'ne-Elohim indeed the idea of creation is not properly applicable; nor could one feel inclined to examine in this direction the beings who serve God as a form of revelation. Originally, it is certain the idea of creation applied to none but material fleshly beings. When God is called the Lord of the spirits of all

[1] Enoch C. vi. (translated by Dillmann), Jude 6; 2 Peter ii. 4.

[2] 1 Sam. xxix. 9; 2 Sam. xiv. 17, 20, xix. 27.

[3] Job v. 1, xv. 15; Deut. xxxiii. 2; Zech. xiv. 5; Ps. lxxxix. 6, 8.

[4] Job iv. 18, xv. 15. (If xxi. 22, xxii. 13, are meant to refer to a judicial trial of men in high position, we should get a thought like that in Isa. xxiv. 21. It seems to me that these passages refer only to the high-throned ruler of the world).

[5] Job v. 1, xxxiii. 23; Zech. i. 12.

[6] This becomes always more and more important, as the influence of the astrological religion of Mesopotamia goes on increasing. (Deut. iv. 19, xvii. 3; Ps. lxxxix. 7.)

[7] Gen. xvi., xviii.; Judg. vi., xiii., etc.

flesh, "spirits without flesh" are not included.[1] In Job "the sons of God" are thought of as present at the very creation of the world, as admiring spectators.[2] The later age of reflection first started the question. Hence it seems to me probable that A includes them in the creation of the "heavenly beings that rule the world,[3] and that Ps. cxlviii. 2–5 contains a similar idea. In Neh. ix. 6 there can scarcely be a doubt of it.

That in Israel's mind, at least since the eighth century, these heavenly beings are very closely connected with the stars does not admit of doubt. In Job the morning stars that praise God are not distinguished from the sons of God.[4] In Deuteronomy the host of heaven plays a great *rôle*, ruling by God's decree over the heathen world.[5] And when the post-exilic prophet, in B. J. xxiv. 21, pronounces judgment on the host of heaven, he evidently identifies the gods of the heathen nations with the stars, and thinks of them as subject to God.[6] But the poetic expression in Judg. v. 20, "The stars in their courses fought against Sisera," enables us to conclude with certainty that this connection between the Elohim and the stars goes back to a very high antiquity.

On the other hand it was altogether foreign to Israel's antiquely realistic mode of thought to change the angels consciously into personifications of God's sovereignty over nature and history. There is not a single passage which really points to any such process. In a number of later Psalms, it is true, the fact comes out all the more clearly that people were

[1] Num. xvi. 22, xxvii. 16.

[2] Job xxxviii. 7. [3] Gen. i. 14, ii. 1. [4] Job xxxviii. 7.

[5] Deut. iv. 19, xvii. 3, xxxii. 8 (B. J. xl. 26).

[6] B.J. xxiv. 23; cf. xxvii. 9. This is probably the original passage to which is due the idea subsequently connected with Gen. vi. of the angels being kept in everlasting chains of darkness, and of Satan being let loose after the millennium (Enoch ii. 6; Jude 6; 2 Peter ii. 4; Rev. xx. 7). (The host of heaven is to be judged along with the kings of earth. Both are threatened with imprisonment, and after many days they are to be visited, which means, I think, that they are to be released).

wont to speak poetically of angels of Jehovah, when they simply wished to give vivid expression to their conviction of God's all-wise and almighty providence. Consequently the religious import of this conception really lies, not in the special personality of the angels, but in their furtherance of God's purposes of salvation. Thus it is said, "The angel of the Lord encampeth round about them that fear Him," "Let the angel of the Lord drive them away and pursue them," "For He shall give His angels charge over Thee to keep Thee in all Thy ways."[1] Ps. xliii. 3 (cxlvii. 15), goes even further, for God's light and truth are personified as angels that attend on the saints. But Ps. civ. 5 is the clearest of all, "God maketh winds His angels, and flaming fire His ministers"; or Ps. cxlviii. 8, "Fire and hail; snow and vapours; stormy wind fulfilling His word."

6. When God is represented as surrounded by attendants, it is natural to suppose that these were thought of as beings of various ranks. Still that cannot be inferred, at least in the sense of the later angelology, from any of the older passages. The story in Josh. v. 13 ff., where the man with a drawn sword who meets Joshua is called captain of the host of the Lord, can hardly belong to the older strata of that book. And in 2 Kings ii. 11, vi. 17, as well as in Judg. xiii. 17, 18, there is no word of the angels having special grades of rank, or names, but only of fiery chariots and horsemen, and of the fact that as the angelic beings are "wonderful," they decline to come within the range of human ken. It is only from the words, cherubim and seraphim, that one could infer that names and titles were given to those beings before the time of Ezra.

In the first place, the cherubim are met with in early passages as beings by whose aid God descends to earth, His winged carriers who may be compared with the wings of the wind, and the thick clouds in which His everlasting light is veiled, that He may draw near the earth in a thunderstorm.[2]

[1] So Ps. xxxiv. 8, xxxv. 5, 6, xci. 11.

[2] So Ps. xviii. 11.

Thus it is still said, in late poetry, "He sitteth upon the cherubim," that is, comes near for judgment.[1] For in this passage the poet is thinking not of the tabernacle adorned with cherubim, but of God as the Lord of the world. It is likewise said, "He maketh the clouds His chariot; He walketh upon the wings of the wind."[2] Hence God is called "He who sitteth upon the cherubim.[3] For this poetic expression has originally no reference to the cherubim above the ark of the covenant, with which, it is true, later times are specially fond of connecting it.[4] It is in this capacity, as commissioners specially entrusted by the God of Israel with His revelation to mankind, that the cherubim are also described in the great visions of Ezekiel.[5]

In the second place, the myth which B gives us represents them as the God-appointed guardians of the tree of life.[6] For this passage is not meant to represent the cherubim as inhabiting paradise in the room of fallen man. With the "flash of a brandished sword," that is, aided by a mighty being whose duty it is to punish (the lightning?), they have to prevent fallen man from getting possession of the sacred tree of life. Hence they watch the garden in which this tree is growing. Later still, Ezekiel, when comparing the king of Tyre to them, describes[7] them in much the same way as the fiery guardians of the mountain of God in Eden, enthroned on

[1] Ps. xcix. 1. [2] Ps. civ. 3.

[3] The יושב הכרבים which alternates with Jahve Zebaoth, 1 Sam. iv. 4; 2 Sam. vi. 2; Ps. lxxx. 2, xcix. 1; 1 Chron. xiii. 6; 2 Kings xix. 15, should always be first translated in this way.

[4] I certainly agree with Riehm that ישב with the accus. is rather a strange way of expressing "enthroned upon the cherubim," for which one would expect על. But that the phrase should mean "He who inhabits the cherubim," *i.e.* He who dwells between their wings, because God is present in the temple under the shadow of the wings of the cherubim, seems to me linguistically still more incredible, since living beings cannot be inhabited like a house. The ark of the covenant is the place where He who sits upon the cherubim reveals Himself, and at first there were no cherubim at all above it.

[5] Ezek. i., ix., x., xi., xliii. [6] Gen. iii. 24.

[7] Ezek. xxviii. 13, 14, 16. Perhaps the word Eden, in xxvii. 23, suggested the idea to him.

lightning, and with their covering wings spread fully out. Thus they protect the heavenly sanctuaries from profanation.

Finally, they are met with as symbolical ornaments of the temple, not only in the ideal picture of A, but also in the description of Solomon's temple, given in the book of Kings and in Chronicles. Their proper place is in the Holy of Holies. In the temple there were two large gilded cherubim on both sides of the sacred ark, which completely covered the Holy of Holies with their outspread wings.[1] In A's ideal description they are small in size, made of gold and fastened to the throne above the ark of the covenant itself, facing each other and overshadowing with their wings the holy place of God's presence.[2] But, besides, they often appear in the ornamentation of the temple as symbols of the divine presence, and less frequently in the description of the tabernacle. The portable washing vessels of the temple are specially ornamented with them.[3]

If we wish to form an opinion as to these beings, we may be certain in the first instance of two things. The one is, that to the Hebrew imagination the cherubim are really *living beings*, not allegories, and beings too from the heavenly world of light, serviceable to God as means of revelation. The other is, that they are, in fact, *products of the imagination;* they belong to that large class of beings with which, from of old, the religious imagination of Asiatics has peopled the heavenly world, and which owe their origin and character mainly to religious symbolism. They are consequently, like every creation of fancy, very variable in form, and do not, like natural objects, brook the restraints of pedantic description.

[1] 1 Kings vi. 23, 28, viii. 6.

[2] Ex. xxv. 18 ff., xxxvii. 7 ff. (1 Chron. xxviii. 18 ff. makes no special reference to them).

[3] Ex. xxvi. 1, 31, xxxvi. 8 ; 1 Kings vi. 32, 35, vii. 29, 36 ; 2 Chron. iii. 10-13, v. 7 f. These "lavers on wheels" appear to have been exported to the farthest north and west to which Phœnician trade extended in the bronze age. Cf. G. C. F. Lisch, "Ueber die ehernen Wagenbecken der Bronze-Zeit" (*Jahrbb. d. Vereins f. mecklenburg. Gesch.* ix. 372 ff., xxv. 215 ff., 1860. (Ewald, *Gött. Nachr.* 1859).

From the earliest days the holy God was pictured by the Hebrew—and certainly not by him alone—as descending to earth in the grandeur of the thunder-storm, seated on the cherubim, that is, making the heavenly beings, who at other times guard his sanctuaries, the vehicles of his revelation. Hence it was natural, with Ewald and Riehm, to think of the black thunder-cloud as the prototype of the cherub. But I must concede to Kosters that, from the analogy of other parts of Asiatic religious symbolism, it appears more likely to have been the storm-winds which carry the storm-God hidden in the cloud and fight for him.[1] Then when the people wished to represent the revealed presence of this God as at rest in the temple at Jerusalem, they had no hesitation in frankly adopting a well-known Asiatic symbol, and making Him a throne over which these cherubim spread their covering[2] wings. The same symbol, too, was put on the walls, doors, and sacred vessels, to express God's holy presence. This was imitated in the ideal sketch of the tabernacle, in which God speaks from between the cherubim[3]; and it is also used in the temple of Ezekiel, although but sparingly.[4] But when Ezekiel thinks of God as coming for judgment, or to bestow on Israel a new proof of His gracious presence, he again sees Him seated on His throne and borne to earth by the cherubim. And wherever God's sacred treasures have to be guarded and hidden, the imagination bethinks itself of these beings as the symbols of God's presence and of God's unapproachableness.

The fullest description of them is given by the prophet Ezekiel. He first sees four living creatures[5] with the general

[1] Among the Assyrians also the storm-winds are in fact "the throne-bearers" of the heavenly deity, the "water-bearers" of the thunder-god when fighting. In Ps. xviii. the wings of the storm carry Jehovah, while the clouds are only His chariot, not the motive power. Hence "the sound of the wings" plays so great a *rôle* (Ps. civ. 3; cf. Ezek. i. 24; 1 Kings xix. 11; B. J. lxvi. 15; Ps. xviii. 11, l. 3). One may also think of Maruts, of the dogs of Indra, and of Odin.

[2] סכך.

[3] Ex. xxv. 22; Num. vii. 89.

[4] Ezek. xli. 18 ff.

[5] Ezek. i. 5 ff. חיות.

appearance of a man, but each with four faces and four wings, and straight legs with the feet of an ox.[1] Under their wings are human hands; and these wings are so joined that they never require to turn. The front face is that of a man; right and left of this are the faces of a lion and an ox, and, behind, that of an eagle. The wings partly cover the body and are partly used for flying, and when the creatures stand still, they let their wings droop; out of the midst of them gleam fire, torches, lightnings; and connected with them are four wheels that can turn in every direction, called whirling wheels.[2] These are, like the creatures, covered with eyes, as a sign of their intelligence. They are living; the spirit of the creatures is in them.[3] These creatures are afterwards discovered by the prophet to be cherubim.[4] On the tips of their wings is poised a vault like that of heaven, with an azure throne of indescribable splendour, on which the glory of God rests. Thus seated, the self-revealing God is borne by the cherubim, with a mighty rushing noise, down to earth, into His temple, and then borne aloft again.[5] They praise God with sacred songs, and give to His commissioner some of the holy fire between the wheels.[6] They are, therefore, heavenly beings from the mysterious world where God dwells,[7] full of divine intelligence and light,[8] the bearers of God's revelation. They are evidently described with great freedom, and remind one of the seraphim of Isaiah. Perhaps the whole picture is taken from the artistic form of the temple lavers,[9] or from some other work of oriental art. At all events afterwards, in his description of the future temple,[10] Ezekiel gives the cherubim only two faces, the right that of a man, the left

[1] Ox-feet, because these, being round, can go both backwards and forwards.

[2] Ezek. x. 12, 13 (גלגל).

[3] Ezek. i. 21, x. 12, 17. [4] Ezek. x. 1 ff., 14 ff., 20. [5] Ezek. ix. 3, x. 3.

[6] Ezek. iii. 12, x. 2. [7] Ezek. iii. 12. [8] Ezek. x. 12.

[9] The Mechonah המכונה, 1 Kings vii. 27 ff. Was this a symbolic representation of the primeval water moved by the power of Jehovah? cf. above).

[10] Ezek. xli. 18 ff.

that of a lion—no doubt because it is impossible to conceive of carved work on a plane surface with more.

Ezekiel's description is certainly much more detailed than anything in the earlier passages. The cherubim of the temple must, from their size, have stood upright, with only one face,[1] doubtless that of a man. They are also represented with only two wings. From the description of the tabernacle one cannot with certainty affirm more than that the passage in Ex. xxv. 20 gives these creatures only one face. The Chronicler has combined the descriptions of the temple and the tabernacle in a manner absolutely impossible, for he makes the large cherubim of the Holy of Holies turn their faces inwards, that is, towards each other, as those of the tabernacle do.[2] From the position of their wings, this is an impossibility. He also brings in Ezekiel's notion of the cherubim-chariot at an unsuitable place.[3] The fact that Ezekiel himself acknowledges that it was only by degrees that he recognised "the creatures" to be cherubim, warrants the inference that his description of them was new. Thus, whether Ezekiel based his description on actually existing works of art or not, he certainly made the figure more complicated, prompted apparently by the consideration that beings which did not turn, needed to have a face each way.[4] The only question is whether this development entirely altered the original idea of the cherubim, by making, as Riehm thinks, composite beings out of winged human forms,[5] or whether it was only a development very easily explained by the variable character of all symbolic figures, and in no way injurious to the original conception.

For Riehm's view there is, in fact, not a little to be said. Since cherubim are found in the temple alternating with

[1] 1 Kings vi. 23. In the temple their height was the same as the breadth of their outstretched wings.

[2] 2 Chron. iii. 11–13. [3] 1 Chron. xxviii. 18.

[4] The divine presence cannot, of course, have a "backwards" and a "forwards." It turns equally towards all the four sides of the world.

[5] Similar in a way, according to the Rabbis, Thenius, Keil, Kurtz.

lions and oxen,[1] it seems improbable that they themselves can have had the form of these animals. Both in the temple and in the tabernacle they are represented as straight, upright, with two wings and one face. Hence, as they certainly were not meant to be huge birds, they are probably winged men. Besides, even in Ezekiel, the principal face is that of the man. But Riehm's theory obviously goes beyond the range of certainty. If the cherub was just an imaginary composite form, it was quite easy and natural for Ezekiel to make it more composite still, so as to suit the purpose of his description; for example, to make out of a figure, the body of which had the feet of an ox, the wings of an eagle, and the mane of a lion, a winged figure with four faces. But it would not be natural to make out of a purely human figure, with wings, a composite animal figure, to which he is himself the first to apply the term "creatures."[2] Now, in the Old Testament, the cherub is, from the very first, represented as something quite well known—in other words, as something that had lived on in the popular imagination since patriarchal times. Absolutely no instructions are given as to how the pictures are to be executed. That is simply left to the artist. This fact points, in my opinion, to extraordinary composite figures like sphinxes, winged bulls, etc., which could be readily made by any one in the usual traditional form, rather than to winged men; for in the latter case more would depend on the general pose of the figure, and detailed instructions would be needed, at any rate, as to the expression and the style. Besides, as ornaments for the sanctuary and its lavers, animal figures were much more in keeping with the oxen, lions, palms, and flower wreaths, than winged men. The passage, Ezek. x. 14, unless we are arbitrarily to assume that there has been a pure error in transcription, can only mean that ox and cherub were practically the same. Furthermore, when the poet in Ps. xviii. makes God ride on a

[1] 1 Kings vii. 29 (36).

[2] חיות, Ezek. i. 5.

cherub he cannot have given it a human form. Lastly, it strikes me as intrinsically improbable that any carved work, representing a human figure, would be placed in the Holy of Holies. To symbolical figures, such as are found all over Asia in connection with temples, there could be no objection; but winged men, as such, were necessarily out of place in connection with Jehovah. Hence I feel constrained to hold to the view that the cherubim were composite figures, with the feet of oxen, the wings of eagles, the manes of lions, and the body and face of men, standing upright, and spreading their broad wings over the sanctuary.[1] Under a variety of influences Ezekiel afterwards made this figure still more composite.

At all events the cherubim were not angels, but symbolical figures, combining the noblest qualities of the created world,— a man being the symbol of intelligence, a lion of sovereignty, an ox of strength, and an eagle of swiftness. They were regarded as the special property of God Himself, as His heavenly servants, seated on whom He descends to earth. It is they who at once proclaim and veil His presence, as He abides in the sanctuary. As proclaiming His presence, while veiling His glory, they are in general the guardians of God's sacred treasures, which no profane person dare touch.[2] These notions are deeply rooted in the sacred symbolism of the ancient world, as is shown by the griffins that guard the divine treasury, the dragons that watch the garden of the Hesperides and the Golden Fleece, the sphinxes in front of the temples, and the storm winds that move the primeval waters, and conduct to earth the glory of the thunder.

[1] It would certainly be difficult for our Western imaginations to conceive of such figures, if we did not actually find ourselves confronted with them, as in the ruins of Nineveh. Vatke's "beak, which was also like a lion's maw," is surely calculated to make one careful. Züllig: "an upright two-footed winged ox, with the face and hands of a man."

[2] סכך Ex. xxv. 20, xxxvii. 9; Ezek. xxviii. 16 (Ps. v. 12, xci. 4, cxl. 8).

Certainly the Israelites never doubted the actual existence of such beings. But they are themselves never regarded as objects of worship, but only as symbols of God's holy presence. Their enigmatic form is in keeping with the mysterious nature of the unsearchable God,—an idea, in fact, that takes a hundred similar shapes in the ancient East. They are imaginary figures of a religious kind, designed to express the thought at once of God's nearness and of God's unapproachableness,—all this being represented, as was the custom of the ancients, in a very real and life-like manner.

That the word "cherubim" has no connection with the Hebrew roots that are nearest to it in sound, I am quite sure. It cannot mean either carved work,[1] or figure of fear.[2] Even the conjecture of Riehm, who connects the word with "the restraining of the divine splendour," points to a characteristic of much too rare occurrence.[3] Still less can it be a transposition for Rekub, "chariot,"[4] for even that is only one side of the cherubim's action, not to speak of the linguistic improbability of such a transposition of the root letters. I think it far more likely that the word belongs to a larger linguistic group; but that is a point on which it certainly does not fall to me to express a decided opinion.[5]

7. What are the seraphim? It is even more difficult to answer this question than to say what the cherubim are. For the only passage in which seraphim are mentioned[6] speaks of

[1] From כרב, to plough, tear up.

[2] From כרב, to render anxious. The connection with כרב, "to cultivate," as if the cherub were the cultivator, the ox, or the meaning "the anxious one" as the servant of the great God, or even the comparison with קרב—"the one kept near," I simply mention as having actually been given.

[3] כרב, constringere.

[4] כרוב for רכוב like סכל כסל, 1 Chron. xxviii. 18; cf. Hofmann, Redslob.

[5] Garuda (*Philostr. Vit. Apoll.* iii. 18), *γρύψ*. If Lenormant gives the right reading, then we have, in the naming of the winged bulls of Nineveh as "Kirubi," the authentic explanation of the word. But it does not become me to pronounce an opinion on the subject. ("Essai de comm. des fragm. cosm. de Bérose d'après les textes cunéiformes," 1871, p. 80.)

[6] Isa. vi. 2 f.

them as if they had been so long and so well known that no explanation was needed by any body. Consequently we have only the most incidental reference to their real character. The description in Ezekiel[1] already suggests a certain connection with the cherubim; and the New Testament adopts the view prevalent in its own day, and without further inquiry assumes that the two are identical.[2] But this can hardly be right. According to Isaiah, the seraphim stand before God in the heavenly sanctuary[3] as His attendants. Each has six wings. With one pair they fly, not indeed as if they were always flying, for they stand before God; but they fly with them when the occasion for flying arises. With another pair, from a feeling of humility, they veil their faces; and with the third pair, from a sense of modesty, they cover their naked "feet." If the last word were used in the ordinary sense, we should have to think of draped human figures, of which only the head and feet require to be veiled. But the prophet may quite as well use the word "feet" in a euphemistic sense, and in that case it would exactly suit the naked bodies of animals.[4] Indeed, on closer examination, draped figures would have no place for the pair of wings with which to cover their "feet." Their face is that of a man, and it is a human voice that issues from their mouth.[5] Their hands, too, are human, and require tongs to lift a burning coal.[6] Their number is considerable; they stand round the heavenly throne in a double choir.[7] They are not cherubim, at all events, in our sense of the term. The cherubim carry or veil God, and show the presence of His

[1] Ezek. i. 11, iii. 12, ix. 3; cf. Isa. vi. 2 ff. (cf. Hendewerck's view in his "Habilitationsschrift," 1836).

[2] Rev. iv. 8.

[3] עמד על, because the servant stands before his Master who is seated; cf. Gen. xviii. 8; Zech. iv. 14.

[4] Cf. רגלים, Isa. vii. 20. [5] Isa. vi. 3. [6] Isa. vi. 3.

[7] The one choir sings, the other responds, and then both sing together. Hence the threefold repetition of "Holy." The phrase "one of the seraphim," suggests that their number was considerable.

glory in the earthly sanctuary. But the seraphim stand before God as ministering servants in His heavenly sanctuary.

It is certainly difficult to obtain from the one passage in which these beings are mentioned a clear conception of their nature. And one readily understands how the name "Saraph" suggested that serpents were meant, and, being connected with the worship of Nehushtan, gave rise to the idea that the seraphim were serpents, likenesses of the one in paradise.[1] But serpents with six wings and also human hands and mouth, and which besides stand erect, would be rather too much even for an Indo-Egyptian imagination.

Nor can they well have been "burning ones"[2]—angels of fire; for, in that case, why should the seraph take the sacred fire from the altar? and what need could he have of tongs with which to take up a burning coal? Of course divine fire must touch the prophet's lips; but the fire with which the heavenly beings are all aglow is as much divine fire as is that between the wheels which is thought of in connection with the cherubim.[3]

I have no doubt that 1 Kings xxii. 19 f. gives us a sufficient explanation of Isaiah's vision. There, also, the prophet sees God on His heavenly throne, with "the host of heaven" standing in attendance on His right hand, and on His left.[4] There, as in Isaiah, God's commission is being executed by one of those standing by. Hence it is certain that here also the seraphim are nothing else than the angel-hosts who are ranged round the throne of God as a holy choir. In fact, the word admits of a very obvious and suitable explanation. According to the kindred Arabic root it means the notables, the princes.[5] This meaning is, indeed, the only suitable one. The throne

[1] Num. xxi. 6, 8; 2 Kings xviii. 4; B. J. xiv. 29, the name שֹׂרָף. Vatke, Ewald, etc.

[2] Lev. x. 16. It would be like מלאכי־אש.

[3] I omit all reference to Serapis, Terafim, etc.

[4] Also עמד על.

[5] سريف سرف cf. Steudel 225 (Sheriff).

of an earthly king is surrounded by none but the highest nobles of the realm, who are in personal attendance on their sovereign. In like manner the "princes of God's host" stand around His throne—the mightiest of the sons of God.

If this explanation be correct we have, in the seraphim, a parallel to the appearance of the captain of the Lord's host to Joshua. In that case we should, of course, have to suppose that the human form is assigned to angels, as to God, only when they appear to men, and that in the heavenly sanctuary they are thought of as beings having symbolically composite figures.

8. From the very first the post-exilic books show a growing inclination to deal with superhuman beings, and thus fill up the gulf between human life and God who is gradually becoming more transcendental. But what is already begun in Zech. i.–viii., and B. J. xxiv., becomes more marked, from the second century onwards, after the manner of an age that is growing more and more theological. Perhaps, too, the tendency is fostered by increasing acquaintance with the views of other Asiatic peoples.

In Daniel the angels are already represented as having special names, such as Michael, Gabriel.[1] They are arranged according to rank;[2] and Persia, Greece, and Judea, have each their respective princes who watch over their interests and fight for them.[3] God has a council (divan) formed of a special class of angels,[4] which promulgates the divine edicts. Angel "myriads"[5] deliver the saints in a very materialistic way.[6] As God's holy servants they wear linen garments, and in token of their princely rank a golden girdle.[7] In other respects they are represented as human figures, surrounded by a halo of glory.[8]

[1] Dan. viii. 16, ix. 21, x. 13, 21, xii. 1.
[2] Dan. x. 13, 21, xii. 1.
[3] Dan. x. 13, 20, 21, xii. 5 ff.
[4] Dan. iv. 10, 20 (עיר).
[5] Dan. iv. 32, vii. 10, 16.
[6] Dan. vi. 22.
[7] Dan. x. 5, xii. 6 (viii. 13).
[8] Dan. viii. 15, x. 6, 16.

In Tobit, Raphael, one of the seven angels, who present the prayers of the saints to God, and have access to Him,[1] is represented as the companion of the young Tobias,[2] although he has nothing more than the semblance of corporeal functions.[3] The book of Enoch[4] regards the cherubim and the seraphim as different orders of angels. In the story of Bel and the Dragon, an angel carries Habakkuk by the hair of his head to Babylon and back, merely to prepare a simple meal for Daniel.[5] In the story of Susannah, an angel of God has to destroy the evildoers.[6] Among the Essenes the names of angels formed part of their secret worship.[7] Among the Hellenists, as in the later Kabbala, the angels are, on the one hand, connected with the divine forces, and on the other with the souls of men, an idea quite foreign to the Old Testament. The New Testament shows that in pious circles there prevailed a belief in angels and demons, similar to that in Tobit; while theologically educated Pharisees, like Paul, had a complete system of angelology. The Sadducees rejected this doctrine as well as the doctrine of the resurrection, probably because they saw in it the danger of an enthusiastic conviction of revelation going beyond the accepted forms of religion.

(*b*) *Doctrine of Man and of Sin.*

CHAPTER XII.

MAN.

LITERATURE.—A. Hahn, *De natura hominis in V. T. obvia*, 1846. Roos, *Grundzüge der Seelenlehre aus d. heil. Schrift*,

[1] Tob. xii. 15. [2] Tob. iii. 24, v. 4 ff., vi. 4 ff. [3] Tob. xii. 19.
[4] Enoch lxi. 10. [5] Bel and the Dragon, 36, 39.
[6] Sus. 55, 59. [7] Joseph. *De Bell. Jud.* ii. 8, 7.

1857. Beck, *Umriss der biblischen Seelenlehre*, 2nd ed. 1862. Delitzsch, *Biblische Psychologie*. Carus, *Psychologie der Hebräer nach ihren heiligen Büchern* (Posthumous Works, vol. v.). Böttcher, *De inferis rebusque post mortem futuris ex Hebræorum et Græcorum opinionibus*, libri duo, L. 1, vol. i. p. 20 ff. Hofmann, *Schriftbeweis* i. 284 ff. Auberlen, art. "Fleisch," and art. "Geist;" Oehler, art. "Herz" (in Herzog, 1st ed.—2nd ed. by Cremer and Fr. Delitzsch). Wendt, *Notiones carnis et spiritus quomodo in vetere Testamento adhibeantur*, 1877; cf. by the same author, *Die Begriffe Fleisch und Geist im biblischen Sprachgebrauche*, Gotha 1878, 1–41.

1. No one looking at the religion of the Old Testament historically will expect to find in it a scientific anthropology or psychology, least of all in the earlier ages, to which the very idea of scientific development was altogether foreign. All that one can expect is a popular view of man as a natural being, a view resting on purely external observation, and while consistent in essential points, admitting of very great freedom of expression. For on such matters a people, although not given to regular philosophical study, has always a tolerably uniform view. The labours of scholars, while conducive to clearness, are also the first cause of distinct divergency of opinion. Besides, we may expect that in the Hebrew nation, as in every ancient people, their view of man was very closely connected with their whole religious development. Before the Greek school made its influence felt, the Old Testament view of man, as a natural being, continued essentially the same, although of course it is only the later writings that afford anything like sufficient material for the treatment of such questions.

From an external point of view, man is primarily flesh (בָּשָׂר), a material finite being, such as we meet with everywhere in the visible world. The term flesh, especially in A (where "all flesh" is a favourite expression of constant

occurrence),[1] represents both men and beasts as belonging to the sphere of material life, and as being actually alive; for matter without life is not flesh but dust, or a vegetable organism. The word "flesh," in itself, means the bodily frame,[2] as distinguished from skin; it means what is firm and yet supple in the living body, as distinguished from bones and blood;[3] and then, by synecdoche, the body itself as a substance used, *e.g.*, for sacrifice or food.[4] It is, therefore, a term in constant use to denote relations between human beings, which depend solely on the bodily life. "To be one flesh," is to be joined bodily into one.[5] My flesh and bone means my blood relation.[6] And, generally speaking, where functions and conditions which concern the human body are described, the word flesh is very frequently used instead of body.[7] Again, by synecdoche, the word denotes material beings themselves as such—men and beasts as animal beings, belonging to the world of sense. Hence, when a man speaks of himself in relation to his material existence, "my flesh" may mean the very same as "I."[8] From such a usage it is easily seen that the word may also be employed to denote the limitations and weaknesses of human nature. Of course, as a product of nature, flesh is neither unholy nor unclean. Otherwise, as Wendt rightly insists, it could not be used in sacrifice. But as distinguished from the divine and spiritual mode of

[1] Gen. vi. 12, 13, 17, 19, vii. 15, 16, 21, viii. 17, ix. 4, 11, 16, 17; Lev. xvii. 14; Num. xvi. 22, xviii. 15, xxvii. 16. (In Isa. xxxi. 3; B. J. xl. 5; Jer. xvii. 5; Ps. lxv. 3, it stands in sharper antithesis to God).

[2] Lev. viii. 31, ix. 11; Num. xix. 5; Job x. 11; Ezek. xxxvii. 6.

[3] Ex. xii. 8; Deut. xii. 27; cf. Gen. ii. 23, xli. 2, 3, 19.

[4] Lev. vii. 15, 19 f.; Num. xi. 4, 13; Jer. vii. 21; Hos. viii. 13; Deut. xii. 15; cf. Ex. xvi. 3, xxii. 30. Of course it can also be applied to any separate part of the body (Gen. xvii. 11, 14, 23, 24). And fulness of "flesh" denotes health and strength in man and beast (Gen xli. 2; Dan. i. 15; Job xxxiii. 25).

[5] Gen. ii. 23 f., and often.

[6] Gen. xxix. 14, xxxvii. 27; Judg. ix. 2; 2 Sam. xix. 13 f. More generally of the kinship of human nature in general, B. J. lviii. 7.

[7] Lev. xv. 13, 16, xxii. 6; Prov. iv. 22.

[8] Ps. xvi. 9, lxiii. 2, lxxxiv. 3. (Indeed, in poetry, even עצמותי (my bones) is used of man as a sentient being, Ps. xxxii. 3, li. 10).

existence, that is, in contrast with God as transcendental, a fleshly being, is also in itself finite, weak, prone to sensuality and selfishness. Man as "flesh" must, in contrast with God, feel that he is worthless,—mere "dust and ashes."[1] And since he belongs to the class of fleshly beings, he is not capable of being filled for ever with the vivifying Spirit of God.[2] Spirit and flesh, God and man, are contradictories. The flesh cannot see God. And God, on His part, has not eyes of flesh, which the outward appearance deceives. The flesh is frail, weak, incapable of justifying itself before God. God is the living, eternal, unchangeable One.[3] And yet, on the other hand, the flesh is also that which moves and feels, in contradistinction to a dead stone, or to bones. Hence, "a heart of flesh" can be contrasted with "a heart of stone" as sensitive.[4]

Now this material being is made alive by the "spirit" (רוּחַ).[5] Spirit is primarily something in motion—air in motion. Hence wind is so termed,[6] and so is the breath in a living creature, since it is air in motion, which betokens life.[7] In like manner the Spirit of God, originally, we may be sure, conceived of in a rather material way, is the power of life and motion inherent in Him.[8] It is from this Spirit of God that

[1] Gen. ii. 7, xviii. 27; Ps. ciii. 14. [2] Gen. vi. 3.

[3] This antithesis to God and spiritual life is found most strongly expressed in Isa. xxxi. 3; Jer. xvii. 5; 2 Chron. xxxii. 8; Job x. 4. (Eyes of flesh, *i.e.* liable to be deceived), Ps. lxxviii. 39. (Frailty), Deut. v. 23. (No flesh can see God), Ps. lvi. 5, etc. (cf. Job iv. 19). Certainly, in such passages, it is the *physical weakness of the creature* that is primarily meant, not *an ethical defect*, or a *metaphysical principle* distinct from God. But, according to the view of the Old Testament, sin, which is common to all and can claim forgiveness, is due simply to this weakness of the material creature.

[4] Ezek. xi. 19, xxxvi. 26. [5] Zech. xii. 1; B. J. xlii. 5.

[6] Gen. viii. 1; Ex. x. 13, 19; 2 Sam. xxii. 11; Ps. i. 4, civ. 4. (With this is connected the meaning, windy, vain; synonymous with הֶבֶל, Job vii. 7, xvi. 3; Jer. v. 13.

[7] Job xix. 17, xxvii. 3.

[8] *E.g.* Gen. i. 2, vi. 3; Job xxxii. 8, xxxiii. 4, xxxiv. 14; Ps. civ. 29, xxxiii. 6. As the thunder is God's "voice," so the storm is His "breath." And poetry attributes to Him the short hot breath that betokens rage, when it describes how He draws near to judge the earth (Ex. xv. 8; Ps. xviii. 16).

all created life, the breath of every living thing comes. The spirit of man is his vital force,[1] which depends on the Spirit of God, and which returns to God whenever the individual life ceases.[2] God is the Lord of the spirits of all flesh.[3] While the spirit of all created beings comes from God's Spirit, the spirit within them is also primarily the breath, which is the material representation of life.[4] But the word next denotes also this life itself, as what moves and influences a person, causing his moods and feelings. Consequently a man may be anxious, dejected, grieved in spirit;[5] just as, on the other hand, a man's spirit may be "refreshed" and "aroused" when he is "in good spirits."[6] Hence it can be said, "in his spirit there is no guile."[7] But as soon as the life represented by the breath ceases, the man's spirit is no longer in him.[8]

The word "spirit" is, from its origin, the natural antithesis to the word "flesh."[9] As possessing motion, life, and invisibility, it is the opposite of what is inert, frail, material. And from expressing the divine motive power, it naturally denotes also the divine forces which rule the world. For, as the vivifying power of God is represented as spirit, so also the

[1] Zech. xii. 1; Ezek. xxxvii. 10; B. J. xlii. 5; Job xxvii. 3, xxxiii. 4, xxxiv. 14; Ps. civ. 30, cxlvi. 4; Eccles. xii. 7.

[2] Job xxxiv. 14; Ps. civ. 29; Eccles. xii. 7.

[3] Num. xvi. 22, xxvii. 16; corresponding to Jer. xxxii. 27, אלהי כל־בשר.

[4] 1 Kings x. 5; B. J. xxvi. 9; Gen. vi. 17, vii. 15, 22. "Shortness" of breath indicates displeasure (Prov. xiv. 29; Job xxi. 4).

[5] Gen. xxvi. 35; Ex. vi. 9; B. J. liv. 6, lxv. 14, lvii. 15; Ps. xxxiv. 19, li. 19; Prov. xvi. 19, xxix. 23, xv. 13, xvii. 22, xviii. 14. When the spirit is no longer "steadfast," "is no more there" because of fear, this is the natural expression for absolute want of courage and strength (Josh. ii. 11, v. 1; 1 Kings x. 5; Ezek. xxi. 12; Isa. xix. 3).

[6] Gen. xlv. 27; Hagg. i. 14; 2 Chron. xxxvi. 22; cf. Prov. xi. 13, xv. 13, xvii. 22; Jer. li. 11; Ps. li. 14. The material basis of all these ideas is still clear enough.

[7] Ps. xxxii. 2, lxxviii. 8; similarly in Num. xiv. 24: "There was another spirit in Caleb." Most clearly in Ezek. xi. 5; Josh. ii. 11, v. 1; Judg. viii. 3 (where the spirit of a man denotes the measure of his courage and strength).

[8] 1 Kings x. 5; Judg. xv. 19; 1 Sam. xxx. 12.

[9] Isa. xxxi. 3

individual acts of power proceeding from Him, the beneficent as well as the baneful, are called "spirits," whether they are conceived of as really personal, or merely as acting like persons.[1] In the same way, all extraordinary individual impulses of the spiritual life in man which God causes may be described as spirits. Thus there is a spirit of heaviness, of jealousy,[2] of wisdom, of power, of might, of prophecy, etc. In many of these meanings the word "breath" (נְשָׁמָה) is a perfect parallel to the word "spirit." It likewise denotes the breath of life given by God to the creature,[3] and then the life itself, of which the breath is the material representation.[4]

As soon as a material being is made alive by the Spirit of God,[5] it becomes a soul (נֶפֶשׁ), or, more accurately, "a living soul" (נֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה)—a self-conscious life with feelings and desires.[6] In so far as this soul is regarded as dwelling in a man, it is the expression of his conscious individual life. When the soul "departs," the man dies;[7] to take one's soul in one's hand is to risk one's life;[8] to seek after the soul means to seek a man's life;[9] and many other expressions prove that the soul is synonymous with the individual conscious life.[10] Hence the soul is the seat of feeling, in the widest sense. It is sad, joyful, angry.[11] It desires, hates,

[1] 1 Kings xxii. 21 ff., and often.

[2] Num. v. 14, 30; Hos. iv. 12. Wendt's choice of the German word "Muth" to indicate these varying "moods" of the spirit is a very happy one.

[3] Gen. ii. 7, vii. 22.

[4] 1 Kings xvii. 17; B. J. lvii. 16; cf. Ps. cl. 6.

[5] Job xii. 10.

[6] So Gen. i. 30.

[7] Gen. xxxv. 18; cf. 1 Kings xvii. 21; figuratively, Ps. xix. 8, xxii. 30.

[8] Judg. xii. 3; cf. v. 18.

[9] *E.g.* Ex. iv. 19; 1 Sam. xx. 1; 1 Kings xix. 10, 14; Ps. xl. 15, etc.

[10] Ex. xxi. 30; Num. xxxv. 31; ransom for the soul (Ps. xlix. 9, 16); Gen. xxxii. 31; Josh. ii. 13, deliver the soul; 2 Sam. i. 9, "my soul is in me." Generally, Ex. xxi. 23; Josh. ix. 24; 1 Kings ii. 23; Prov. xxii. 23, 25. In this sense the millstone, as a condition of sustaining life, is called "the soul of the poor" (Deut. xxiv. 6).

[11] Gen. xliv. 30. So soul is knit to soul (1 Sam. xviii. 1; cf. Judg. xvi. 16, xviii. 25; 1 Sam. i. 10; 2 Sam. xvii. 8). Akin to this is, "to afflict, defile the soul" (Lev. xvi. 29, 31; cf. xi. 43 f.).

loves, and wishes.[1] Hence a man's soul may mean much the same as "his desire, his wish;" and this idiom is even applied to God.[2] Hence, the verb meaning "to breathe afresh," according to the desire of one's heart, is beautifully derived from the word "soul."[3] And because the soul is that in man which feels, wishes, and wills, it is the proper word for his individual personality. Whenever a person speaks of his feelings, wishes, etc., he may, instead of using "I," also say "my soul."[4]

But not only has man a soul; he is "a living soul," as a beast also is. For in this lies the peculiarity of a living being, which actually distinguishes it from a non-animal created thing.[5] Consequently, "souls" just means men, persons.[6] Hence since a dead person is still "somebody," it is strictly correct to call him "a soul."[7] Thus a man can say, "let my soul die," "my soul lives"; while, on the other hand, death is the departure of the soul,[8] and a person lives by his soul. This soul, as the sentient personal life of man, is conceived of as

[1] *E.g.* Gen. xxvii. 4, 19, 25; B. J. xlii. 1 (of God); Ps. xi. 5, xlii. 3, xciv. 19; Song of Solomon, iii. 1–3. So one pours out one's soul before God (1 Sam. i. 15). Purely poetic in Isa. v. 14, of Sheol.

[2] *E.g.* Ps. xvii. 9, xli. 3, lxxviii. 18; Ex. xxiii. 9; B. J. lvi. 11; even of cattle, Prov. xii. 10; of God, Lev. xxvi. 11, 30. The expression in Isa. xxix. 8 goes furthest of all, for there "soul" is used as synonymous with desire of food, appetite, "stomach."

[3] נפשׁ, Ex. xxiii. 12 (of God, Ex. xxxi. 17).

[4] *E.g.* Num. v. 6; Judg. xvi. 30, etc. Thus a friend is "as one's own soul," 1 Sam. xviii. 1, 3; Deut. xiii. 7—*i.e.* trusted as one's own self; or dear as life ?? (1 Sam. xx. 17).

[5] Gen. i. 20, 21, 24, ii. 7, 19, ix. 10, 12, 16, xlvi. 15, 18, 22 ff., 27; Ex. i. 5, x. 4, 16, xii. 18 f., xvi. 16; Lev. ii. 1, iv. 2, 27, v. 1, 4, 15, 17, 21, vii. 18, 20, 21, 25, 27, xi. 10, 46, xvii. 10, 29; xix. 8, xx. 6, 25, xxii. 3, 11, xxiii. 29 f., xxiv. 17, 18, xxvii. 2; Num. xvii. 30, xix. 13, 20, 23. Especially frequent "to destroy a soul from among the people"; cf. Gen. xvii. 14. Especially strong, "the blood of a soul," Prov. xxviii. 17.

[6] So "to get souls," in the sense of getting persons as slaves, Gen. xii. 5; Lev. xxii. 11. So "to smite souls"=to take life, Gen. xxxvii. 21; Num. xxxi. 19, xxxv. 11, 15, 30; Josh. xx. 3, 9. So "souls" for "people" in the phrase "despised by people," B. J. xlix. 7.

[7] Lev. xxi. 1 f., xxii. 4, xix. 28; Num. v. 2, ix. 6, 10 (more precisely נפשׁ מת, vi. 6).

[8] Judg. xvi. 30; 1 Sam. xvii. 55; Num. xxiii. 10; Gen. xii. 13, xix. 19 f.

embodied in the blood like the spirit in the breath, no matter whether it is more accurately expressed as "the soul is in the blood,"[1] or more boldly as "the blood which is the soul."[2]

Hence we see the special significance of the "heart" (לֵב)[3] in the religious terminology of the Old Testament. The heart, as the centre from which the blood circulates, is the centre of the soul's activity—the centre not merely of the world of feelings and wishes, but likewise of the plans and counsels of the understanding, and of the conscience.[4] "Without heart" means "without understanding."[5] It is not the head or the brain but the heart, which the Hebrew considers the seat of thought, of counsel, of conscience, and of moral guidance. A new heart means a complete change of thoughts, views, and aims. This soul, as the irredeemable jewel, is the peculiar treasure of man's personality. The oldest writings of the Hebrews are fond of describing it by poetic expressions, which are meant to indicate its unique value. It is the glory of a man;[6] it is "his only one"[7] for the deliverance of which all else must be surrendered and sacrificed.

The simple facts of the Old Testament use of language in reference to man in his natural condition, as we have just stated them, easily explain how the three principal terms—spirit, soul, and body—may be used in relation to each other in very different senses, so that scholars have ample scope for

[1] Lev. xvii. 11*a*.

[2] Gen. ix. 4; Lev. xvii. 11*b* (where בנפֶשׁ and דמו are explanatory glosses). (Deut. xii. 23).

[3] Parallel with this we have in poetry כליות, to include the more delicate internal organs of life (Ps. xvi. 7, xxvi. 2, מעים; Ps. xl. 9; קרב, Ps. lxiv. 7; ciii. i. (רחמים).

[4] *E.g.* Ex. iv. 21; Gen. vi. 5, viii. 21; Josh. vii. 5, xi. 20; Prov. iv. 23, xv. 13 f., xvi. 5, 23, xxiv. 32; Isa. x. 7; B. J. xlii. 25; Job xii. 2 f.; Judg. xvi. 17; Ps. li. 12, "a pure heart" is=*conscientia bona*. Wendt is quite right in remarking that the German word "Sinn" is a better rendering of the word לב than the word "Herz."

[5] Hos. vii. 11; Jer. v. 21; Prov. xvii. 16, etc.; senseless.

[6] Gen. xlix. 6; Ps. vii. 6 (xvi. 9. lvii. 9, cviii. 2), כבוד.

[7] יחידה, Ps. xxii. 21, xxxv. 17; Job ii. 4; Ps. xlix. 9.

the exercise of their ingenuity in constructing out of them a complicated system of psychology. It is self-evident that the *spirit*, the force breathed into man by God, awaking life in him, belonging to all men alike and returning to God, can be distinguished from the *soul*, the separate personal life of the creature, which comes into existence whenever the spirit that proceeds from God renders a portion of matter capable of independent existence, and which consequently exists in relation to God as a separate creature. And it is still more self-evident, that this soul and this spirit can be distinguished from the bodily substratum within which they develop their vital energy.

Consequently, unless one carefully studies the context of the passages compared, one can easily persuade oneself that there is already in the Old Testament that threefold division of man into body, soul, and spirit, which is certainly found in the later Jewish schools of philosophy that came under the influence of Greek thought, and which thus found its way naturally into the thought of several New Testament writers.[1] But every unprejudiced person, on observing how these terms are interchanged in the frankest manner possible, or supplement each other, will acknowledge that even the appearance of justification for such a view has vanished.[2] If the spirit be regarded as the life that has become the man's own, then it is not a substance alongside of the soul, but that very life which the person feels to be the source of his activity; only, if one speaks of spirit, the emphasis falls on the vital force common to all men, which connects them with God; whereas, when the soul is mentioned, men's personal feelings, experiences, thoughts, and wishes are put in the foreground. The soul, like the spirit, leaves a man at death, and it returns to one who returns to life.[3] If a man's spirit is

[1] 1 Thess. v. 23; Heb. iv. 12.

[2] Most clearly Job xii. 10, vii. 11; B. J. xxvi. 9.

[3] 1 Kings x. 5; Judg. xv. 19; Ps. lxxvii. 4, cxlvi. 4; 1 Sam. xxx. 12; cf. Gen. xxxv. 18; 1 Kings xvii. 21; 2 Sam. i. 9; Jonah ii. 8, iv. 3; Ps. cvii. 5 (just as we say "life is going," "consciousness is going"); cf. Ps. xxxi. 6.

broken, saddened, distressed, his soul is also broken, saddened, and distressed.[1] In fact, *spirit* may often be parallel with *heart*, because the same conditions of life may, in respect of *form*, be represented as increase or decrease of the vital force and energy, and, in respect of *contents*, as special moods of individual experience and temperament.[2] And just as spirit and heart stand parallel to each other, we likewise find soul and heart combined; in which case "with all the soul" denotes full personal acquiescence, and "with all the heart," full determination of the mind.[3] Now the Ego as a sentient personality is called not merely "my soul" but likewise, although more rarely, "my body," "my bones,"—in so far, that is, as it refers to bodily states.[4] Such being the perfect freedom which we find in popular and poetic diction, we can only declare it certain that a distinction is always drawn between the bodily substratum and the life revealed in it. But this life which is revealed in the body is, at one time, described as *spirit*, when the emphasis is to be put on the power of life and will which has its origin in and is connected with God, and which is common to all men; and, at another, as *soul*, *i.e. heart*, when the individual personal life produced by God is to be spoken of with its world of experiences or views.[5] Of course the words are never absolutely synonymous.

The Old Testament is, at any rate, as far as possible from holding the idea of a pre-existent soul which is clothed with a body, that it may live an earthly life, whether as a promotion, or whether it is in this way degraded from its own

[1] Gen. xxvi. 35; Ex. vi. 9; B. J. liv. 6; 1 Sam. i. 15; cf. 1 Sam. i. 10; Job xxi. 4; Judg. xviii. 25; 2 Sam. xvii. 8.

[2] Ex. xxxv. 21; Ps. xxxiv. 19, li. 19; B. J. lvii. 15; cf. Ps. lxxvii. 4, 7, lxxviii. 8, cxliii. 4 (1 Sam. i. 15; cf. Ezek. iii. 7; Isa. xxix. 24; cf. Ps. xcv. 10). Also B. J. liv. 6, lxv. 14, Prov. xv. 13, Ps. cxlvii. 3, cix. 16, li. 12 (cf. lvii. 8, cviii. 2, cxii. 7) show the close affinity of the terms.

[3] Deut. iv. 29, x. 12, xi. 13, xxx. 6; Josh. xxii. 5.

[4] Ps. vi. 3 f., xvi. 9, xxxii. 3, xxxv. 9, li. 10, lxiii. 2, lxxxiv. 3.

[5] Cf. Wendt, *l.c.* 27.

higher spiritual existence and forced into the bonds of the material world. In the oldest passage in which such a view has been discovered,[1] the simpler expression, "The Lord killeth, and maketh alive," has as its parallel the poetically bold declaration, "He hurleth down to Sheol, and raiseth up." But there is here nothing more than a conviction of God's absolute power over life and death, over the upper world as over the world of shades.[2] Of a sojourn of unborn beings in the realm of Sheol the writer is not even thinking. Nor can the passage in Job i. 21 serve as a proof of any such thought. When Job says "Naked came I out of my mother's womb, and naked shall I return thither," his meaning cannot be that the womb out of which he came is the womb of Sheol, in which his soul had sojourned before his birth. For in other passages of the book the development of the embryo in the womb is conceived of as a direct act of God's creative power, and regarded as the genesis of personality.[3] With an inexactitude allowable in poetry two things are identified which are not exactly co-extensive,—existence in the womb of the earth, the common mother of all, after a life of consciousness, and existence in the womb of one's mother previous to this life of consciousness.[4] The point emphasised is simply this, that neither condition admits of possessions or honour.

It is somewhat different with the expression in Ps. cxxxix. 15, "When I was curiously wrought in the lowest parts of the earth." Elsewhere "the lowest parts of the earth" denotes the realm of the dead,[5] and in a Psalm of so very late a date, we might quite well expect a reference to the Hellenistic doctrine of pre-existence, which is quite clearly referred to afterwards in the Apocrypha.[6] At all events, the view that the psalmist is here speaking of a soul's existence in Sheol previous to its life on earth is very much more

[1] 1 Sam. ii. 6. [2] Just as in 2 Kings v. 7 (Ps. ix. 14); Deut. xxxii. 39.
[3] *E.g.* Job x. 8 ff. [4] Cf. Ecclus. xl. 1. [5] Ps. lxiii. 9.
[6] Wisd. Sol. viii. 19 f. (Tu Marcellus eris. Virg. *Æn.* vi. 713 ff., 884).

probable than the fantastic notion that he means to express a hope that his personality will be re-born after death in the world of shades. But since the psalmist in ver. 13 simply expresses the popular view as to the origin of human life, and since he must have confused soul and body, were he to speak here of pre-existence, there is nothing left for us but to suppose that this dark expression must be intended as a poetical description of the mysterious origin of an infant's life.[1]

In the account of creation which B gives, he directly contradicts the doctrine of the pre-existence of the soul. The body is formed first, and then the soul is breathed into it. Consequently man is, so to speak, first body, then soul.[2] By the manifestation of the creative Spirit of God, a portion of matter is made capable of a separate existence—in other words, it receives a soul. And A's account of creation is in no way different from this. Through God's creative word man comes into being, possessed of body and soul; and by ordinary generation a second man was begotten "in the image of Adam." Consequently the whole man, not merely the body, depends on the development of the species. The blessing of fruitfulness is given to men in the very same terms as to beasts.[3] Hence human life is primarily only one of the forms in which animal life is manifested. In relation to God it is simply a created thing, just as the life of beasts is.

All through the Old Testament this is the standpoint from which the relation of man to God is measured. Even if the name Enosh (אֱנוֹשׁ) does not, by its very etymology, point to the frailty and weakness of man, it is beyond all doubt frequently used in this signification.[4] The old narrative calls man "flesh;"[5] and A classes man and all other animals

[1] In Ezek. xviii. 4, of course, the phrase, "Every soul belongs to God," merely means that God concerns Himself as much about the life of one as about the life of another.

[2] Gen. ii. 7.

[3] Gen. i. 22, 26, 28, v. 3.

[4] Ps. viii. 5 (Job xxv. 6).

[5] Gen. vi. 3.

together as "flesh." Hence, in the song of the early psalmist, it is the highest proof of God's love and glory that He bestows such high honour on a being so insignificant by nature as man.[1] The truly pious address God with the full consciousness of being but "dust and ashes."[2] And all the writers of the Old Testament speak in this strain. He who is born of woman, formed of clay, whom the breath of the Almighty has made, stands over against the spiritual personal God as a weak creature of the dust. Being flesh, and therefore mortal, he cannot be measured by the standard of divine being.[3] God remembers that man is but a wind that passeth away and cometh not again.[4] He knoweth the children of men who must go down to the pit.[5] Man, even as man, is not in a position to contend with God, and to enter into judgment with Him. Even were he innocent, he could not answer for himself.[6] But he cannot be innocent. Every son of man is by nature vain, deceitful, weak, and full of faults.[7] Hence, "Cursed is the man that trusteth in man and maketh flesh his arm!" Foolish is he who is afraid of man that shall die, and of the son of man who shall be made as grass.[8] His generation is fleeting and frail. Were God to take back His breath to Himself, then all men would become dust.[9] "Cease ye from man in whose nostrils is a fleeting breath, for wherein is he to be accounted of?"[10]

[1] Ps. viii. 5. [2] Gen. xviii. 27.

[3] Ps. lvi. 5, 12, lxv. 3, lxxviii. 39; cf. Job iv. 19, xiv. 1 ff., xxxiii. 6; Isa. xxxi. 3, 8; B. J. lvi. 2.

[4] אנוש, especially frequent in antithesis to God (Ps. ix. 21, x. 18, lvi. 2; B. J. li. 12); "Not to be measured by the divine standard" (Job vii. 7, 12, 16, 18; Ps. lxxviii. 39, lxxxix. 48, cxliv. 3).

[5] בני־אדם, Ezek. xxviii. 2–7, xxxi. 14. Even Ezekiel's usual phrase for himself when addressed by God, בן־אדם, has this meaning, ii. 1, 3, 8, iii. 1, 3, 4, 10, 17, iv. 1, vi. 2, vii. 2, viii. 5, and often.

[6] Job ix. 2, 11 ff., 19 ff., 29 ff.; Jer. xii. 1.

[7] Hos. xi. 9; Job xiii. 25 f., 28, xiv. 1, 4, xv. 16, xxv. 4; cf. Ps. xxxix. 6, 7, 12, lxii. 10.

[8] Jer. xvii. 5; B. J. li. 12. [9] Ps. civ. 29; Job xxxiv. 14 ff.

[10] Isa. ii. 22. (The attribute, "fleeting," is got from נשמה and its context; cf. רוח, הבל.)

Accordingly, that false contempt for the body into which, like every age of declension, later Judaism fell, has no foundation at all in the healthy realism of the Old Testament religion. And the pious in Israel are equally free from the self-exaggeration of Greek spiritualism, in which the difference between man and God dwindles away to one of degree. Man is an animal being, like all around him. And even according to the view of B, it appears to be just what must as a matter of course befall man, when regarded solely from the side of nature,—that he should, when his individual life is over, return to the dust whence he was taken, and that the Spirit of God which animates him should be withdrawn from him, as from other individual earthly beings. For in this narrative death is, it is true, a punishment for sin, and there is a possibility of man "living for ever," should he eat of the tree of life. But this simply shows that such "eternal life" is not dependent solely on man's own development. Accordingly, when God intimates his punishment to the man, He says, just as if He were speaking of something quite in accordance with the nature of things, "till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken: for dust thou art, and unto dust shall thou return." [1]

2. But although the Old Testament includes man, so far as his natural life is concerned, in the same class as the other living creatures of earth, it is equally certain that it likewise recognises a special dignity and glory which belongs to man alone, of all earthly beings, and which raises him not merely comparatively but absolutely out of the ranks of the animals. Thus the singer of Ps. viii.[2] exults because, by God's unmerited grace, "man is but a little lower than the Elohim." For he does not mean to speak of God as God. He does not say "he is but a little lower than Thou," or a little lower than "Jehovah." The Septuagint and the Targum give the mean-

[1] Gen. iii. 19. [2] Ps. viii. 6.

ing quite correctly, although they limit the meaning of the word too much, when they translate "than the angels." Hence man is certainly lower than the class of divine, spiritual, ruling beings. He is still "flesh." But he stands, in the constitution of the world, next to this class of beings; there is only a slight gap between them. Indeed, "the breath of man is a lamp of the Lord."[1] Man is not merely, like the rest of nature, a revelation of God to others, but to himself also. The Spirit of God is for him not merely a vivifying spirit, but also the spirit of a conscious, personal, moral life—the spirit of wisdom, of might, of art, of prophecy. He is not merely an instrument for the spirit, as nature is; but he is able by the help of the Spirit to make nature itself his instrument. In this way he, too, is naturally put into the very position of influence which belongs to beings like the Elohim, as contrasted with flesh. He is God's vicegerent upon earth:

> "Thou hast put all things under his feet:
> All sheep and oxen,
> Yea, and the beasts of the field;
> The fowl of the air, and the fish of the sea,
> Whatsoever passeth through the paths of the seas."[2]

The narrative by B of man's creation shows, in the clearest manner possible, this unique position of man in the category of created beings. The body of the man is formed by a special exercise of God's artistic power, as is the body of the woman afterwards.[3] The Spirit of God is communicated to the man by an operation which God personally performs upon him.[4] Human life is therefore regarded as in a definite personal relation to the divine life. Man does not merely reveal this divine life as a natural life, in the way it is revealed by the other forms of individual life in nature; he reveals it as a life personally active, self-conscious, and free. Hence the other terrestrial creatures are created with express reference to man.[5] He is

[1] Prov. xx. 27.
[2] Ps. viii. 7–10.
[3] Gen. ii. 7, 21, 22, יצר, בנה).
[4] Gen. ii. 7 (cf. on the other hand, ver. 19).
[5] Gen. ii. 19 (different in A).

given the right of naming them, and thus of showing himself their master by His knowledge of them.[1] These expressions imply that man is the ruler of every created thing that lives on the earth. In relation to him, the other living things are his property. Hence, too, the life of an animal can be given to God as an atonement for human sin, while the body of the animal is used as human food.[2] Thus man, though as a terrestrial being mere dust and ashes, is, by the grace of God, exalted high above every other creature that lives on the earth.

In harmony with these ideas, man is represented all through the Old Testament as exalted in a unique manner above all the inhabitants of earth. For him God has, in a special sense, emptied out upon the earth the cornucopia of His blessings.[3] Man is capable of holding personal communion with God, and of living a life that reaches out beyond space and time. The Spirit of God is for him not merely the spirit of life, but also the spirit of wisdom and understanding, of counsel and might. To get convinced of this, one requires but to refer to Israel's covenant with God, to his position of sonship, and to the figures of the prophets who are considered worthy of proclaiming "the word of God." As a spiritual and personal being, man is the goal of creation.

We find this belief most clearly expressed in A's account of creation. Before God creates man as the crown of His creative work on earth He takes counsel, so to speak, with Himself as to His intentions. He does not say, "Let there be men," but "let us make man."[4] Man is something new, not merely a higher stage in the animal world. And with all the emphasis of repetition it is said that God made man

[1] Gen. ii. 19 (and whatsoever the man called every living creature, that was its name).

[2] So Gen. iii. 21, iv. 4. (According to A it was only after the flood that the life of the animals became the property of man, Gen. ix. 3 ff.; Lev. xvii. 11).

[3] Ps. civ. 15 ff.

[4] Gen. i. 26.

"in His own image," "after His own likeness."[1] It is now rightly acknowledged that these famous words cannot denote, as the old Protestant orthodoxy maintained, a state of moral perfection such as no longer characterises men as we find them in the world of experience. For apart from the fact that A knows nothing of a fall, but simply makes Seth succeed Adam, it is said in Gen. v. 1, 3, in direct reference to man being created in the image of God, that Adam in turn begat a son, Seth, in his own image. And the same narrator speaks later on quite naïvely[2] of actual men who lived after the flood as "made in the image of God."[3]

Nor can this expression, at least in its most special nuance, refer to a bodily likeness between man and God. True, it should not be denied that the body, as expressing the self-manifesting personality, must have seemed to this narrator to have the likeness of God, and to bear the stamp of the dignity characteristic of human nature. The human form is, as a matter of course, the form in which both God and the angel of God appear. And in view of the attention paid in these early ages to the visible and the sensuous, this side of it must not be too lightly estimated. But in the religion of the unportrayable God, and especially in this writer, that cannot be the full meaning of the expression. Still less can it be exhausted by the thought of man's lordship over nature. This is merely the natural consequence of such special dignity, just as it is also connected in Ps. viii. with his relation to the Elohim.

In the connection in which it occurs this expression admits, in my opinion, of only one meaning. In contrast with the

[1] Gen. i. 26, v. 1. The difference between צלם and דמות is simply the difference between the *concrete* and the *abstract*. In like manner כ and ב correspond (comparing him with the likeness side by side, including him in the likeness).

[2] Gen. ix. 6.

[3] The New Testament also does the same (1 Cor. xi. 7, James iii. 9), although on the other hand, following the philosophy then in vogue which referred Gen. i. to the Ideal Man, the Logos, it takes this "made in the image of God" as expressing the ideal of humanity.

material, transitory, limited nature of "the flesh," there is the Elohim nature, which finds perfect, personal expression in God Himself, who is a spiritual, eternal, independent Being, self-ruling, self-conscious, personal, and almighty. This nature man does not possess. He is a material being, belonging to the category of "flesh." But, on the basis of the material, he alone of earthly beings reflects this spiritual, personal nature. The image is the stamp left by a living spiritual Being upon an inferior sensuous substance. Thus the seal of the Elohim nature is stamped, as it were, on the substance of the fleshly nature. On the basis of impersonal life, man is to be personal; on the basis of a transitory life, spiritual; on the basis of a limited, sensuous life, morally free.

3. Whether aboriginal man ever possessed a special nobility of nature, which was afterwards lost, is a question the solution of which can be sought for only in the accounts by B and A of the origin of man. For it will hardly be maintained that any other Old Testament writer even hints at such an idea.[1] As an answer to this question, the view given in B's narrative is perfectly decisive.[2] Beyond all doubt he tells us of a first sin, and certainly, therefore, of a previous condition in which there was as yet no actual sin—that is to say, he tells us of a state of innocence.[3] Now, if we have been right in taking this narrative, with its miraculous trees and speaking animals, as mythical, it cannot at any rate be meant to teach us anything about the historical condition of aboriginal man. It accordingly gives us the thoughts of Old Testament saints as to the power of sin over humanity in general, and as to the

[1] How little Old Testament piety hesitated to acknowledge with gratitude the full glory of human nature, even in men as they now are, is shown by Ps. viii. Even the late declaration in Eccles. vii. 29, "God made men upright, but they have sought out many inventions," is merely a statement of belief regarding God the Creator, not a historical testimony as to man's original condition.

[2] Gen. ii. 4*b*–iv. [3] Gen. ii. 7–25.

essence and origin of human sin apart from its particular development in different individuals. But even one who imagines he can treat this narrative as historical, provided he really wishes to take a meaning out of the passage and not put one in, will soon realise the truth of these words of Schleiermacher:[1] "Even were the question as to whether this section was meant to be historical distinctly answered in the affirmative, nevertheless we should not get anything out of it from which we could obtain a historical knowledge of such a state of innocence." Everything that this narrative actually tells us, follows as a matter of course, as soon as it is understood to speak of mankind, and that, too, in a condition prior to the first sin. The knowledge of the man consists, first, in his recognising the woman as part of himself—in other words, in having right natural feelings;[2] and, secondly, in giving the animals names—in other words, in maintaining lordship over the creatures primarily by speech, inasmuch as knowledge is the first stage of appropriation.[3] The moral condition of mankind is not described any further than by stating that the man and the woman in living together are not ashamed of being naked;[4] that is to say, they possess that innocence of childhood with which every human life starts afresh, and which is probably the uncorrupted starting-point of morality, but at all events not its goal. It is simply assumed as self-evident that there was, previous to the fall and to the experience which it afforded of sin and guilt, a state of unconscious innocence.[5] Finally, as regards the religious relationship of man to God, man hears the voice of God commanding and instructing him. But that is the case afterwards even with Cain, not to speak of Noah and Abraham.[6] So there is nothing told save what is absolutely self-evident. There is not the faintest indication of an actual primitive condition being described,

[1] *Glaubensl.* § 72. [2] Gen. ii. 23. [3] Gen. ii. 19 f.
[4] Gen. ii. 25, שְׁנֵיהֶם. [5] Gen. ii. 17; cf. iii. 7.
[6] Gen. iii. 9 ff., iv. 6 f., vii. 1 ff., xii. 1 ff.

much less of any doctrine regarding such a condition. In this narrative we can find nothing more than an expression by Old Testament saints of faith in the destiny and dignity of human nature, a faith which, in spite of all the testimony of experience to the dimness of this nature in individual men, holds fast to the divine thoughts revealed in the creation of man.

With this, the other features of the narrative correspond. Man is fitted for fellowship with God, and hears His voice, the voice of the moral law. He can and should do the will of God, freely and lovingly.[1] The earth is given him as the field of his activity. It is in the first instance, by the goodness of God, made a garden, so as to afford man easy work and innocent enjoyment.[2] As speaker and thinker, he rules over the inhabitants of the earth, and thus the whole realm of the knowable and the beautiful lies open to him as his life-work.[3] The closest and strongest of ties is made the foundation of all moral intercourse: the love of husband and wife, the marriage of one man with one woman—a union in which, according to God's appointment, the wife is to be a help, not a toy, or a being leading an idle, aimless life, but a helpmeet for man, in other words a human being with equal rights, not a slave to male tyranny.[4] And the life of man, of course on its natural side as material and finite, is subject to dissolution, and returns to the dust from which it is taken. But on the ideal side it is capable of attaining to an eternal life, like that of the Elohim. In the garden of Eden there grows the tree of life,[5] to eat of which would confer indissoluble life. Man, as sinful, is, it is true, driven away from this tree. But if without sin, he would, according to the meaning of the narrative, have succeeded in eating of its fruit. Hence, immortality is certainly implied in the idea of

[1] Gen. ii. 16–21. [2] Gen. ii. 8 ff., 16.
[3] Gen. ii. 19 ff. [4] Gen. ii. 18, 21–24.
[5] Gen. ii. 9, iii. 22, 24 (cf. the tree of life of Bundehesch, the sacred tree of the Hindoos, of the Assyrians; cf. Layard, *Nineveh and Babylon*, p. 426).

man. When human nature is thought of, apart from its actual disorder, it must be conceived of as not subject to death. But, as a sinner, man is deprived of eternal life and given over to death and the doom that follows. The tree of life grows only in the garden of Eden. Eternal life does not reside in human nature as such. It lies before man as his moral goal, dependent on communion with God and the ideal man. According to the narrative, this tree, like the other tree beside it, is certainly meant to be a real tree, having physical properties. But it is on the soil of religious thought that such trees grow and bear fruit.

It is obviously a strong point in favour of our having rightly gauged the bearing of this passage, that nowhere in all the Old Testament is there any mention made of the historical condition of primeval man. This silence would hardly be possible, were such a doctrine taught in one of the most celebrated documents dating at least from the ninth century. Prophecy has to do with quite a different "state of innocence," and with quite a different fall from that of Adam: with the ideal of the people and its fall. Of course we should not be surprised to find in the prophetic writings allusions to Adam and his sin, just as references to Abraham, Jacob, and Noah are by no means rare. Were there any such allusions, they would be mere reminiscences of the very earliest history, not doctrines regarding the original state of man and the fall. But it seems to me wrong to find such allusions in any of the Old Testament books that have come down to us. In Job xxxi. 33, it is not said, "If like Adam I concealed my sin"—for that is certainly not the characteristic of Adam's conduct, according to the narrative in Genesis—but "If I after the manner of men kept my sin secret."[1] Hosea vi. 7 is to be translated, as is clear enough from vi. 4, v. 10, "They are as men who have transgressed a covenant," *i.e.* utterly untrustworthy, deceitful men.[2]

[1] Cf. Ps. xvii. 4, לפעלות אדם, "as men are wont to do."

[2] Or else, "They transgress My covenant as if it were a human covenant."

Lastly, in B. J. xliii. 27, the context shows that "the first father" of Israel who sinned, is not Adam, for Israel is being contrasted with the other nations. It is rather Jacob-Israel who is meant, the real ancestor and true prototype of the people, who in fact appears also in Hosea and Jeremiah as the ancestor from whom the sin of the people has been inherited.[1] The fall of Adam is first referred to after the fashion of the scribes in the Apocrypha.[2]

Now if B's narrative does not warrant us in finding in the Old Testament the doctrine of a historical state of perfection, A's leads, beyond all doubt, to the same conclusion. In this narrative, immediately after the description of man's creation in the image of God, and of the blessing bestowed upon him, we are told how the race was continued from Seth to Noah. It is then simply mentioned that all this race, with the exception of Enoch and Noah, fell into a state of deep depravity; and this is regarded as fully accounted for by the weakness of the flesh.[3] It is thus nowhere assumed that our first parents possessed a nobility of nature now lost. No doubt it is said that man was created good, and indeed very good, like every created thing. But he is thereby merely declared to be, like all other creatures, good in his natural condition, *i.e.* in accordance with the creative will of God[4]—in other words, furnished with all the qualities of body and spirit necessary for such a creature. As to whether he was also good as a moral being, the narrative says, and can say, nothing. Creation as such cannot make anything either morally good or morally bad; nothing but the exercise of free will can do that. Creation can only produce what is morally indifferent, that which is as yet neither good nor bad, that is to say—innocence.

From these narratives, therefore, we can infer nothing as to the moral and religious condition of primeval man. But B and A show us, we may be sure, the religious view of what

[1] Hos. xii. 4 ff.; Jer. ix. 3.
[2] Wisd. Sol. ii. 23 ff.
[3] Gen. i. 26 ff., v. 11 ff.
[4] Gen. i. 31.

was set before humanity, as the goal and object of its being—that is, *the divine idea of man.* It is man's primary duty to exhibit the life of the Elohim on the natural stage of the material earth; he has to raise himself to the level of a personal, spiritual Being. He has to hold religious communion with God. For since God created man for a special purpose of His own, He speaks at once to His new creature and tells him of his vocation.[1] And wherever men are mentioned who are regarded as true examples of a perfect human life, such as Enoch or Noah, it is said that they walked with God[2]—in other words, that they constantly felt that their whole life was being spent in the presence of God. Hence morality and religion are reckoned the most characteristic possessions of every one who wishes to be a true man; and they are conceived of as being attainable by man as a personal and spiritual being. Upon this conviction that man was endowed at creation with a capacity for fellowship with God and for moral life, the whole religion of Israel, with its idea of the kingdom of God, its worship, and its prophecy, is founded.

In the next place, family life belongs to the idea of man. God creates man "male and female," and bestows on them the blessing of fruitfulness. Marriage, as the union of one man and one woman, is the natural foundation of all the moral development of mankind.[3] Lastly, it belongs to the idea of man that he should rule over the earth. Man is, by his knowledge and will, to appropriate to his own uses the soil of mother earth, as well as all its creatures, and make them minister to his higher life.

4. Of special interest is the question, whether and in what age one can find in the Old Testament the ideal premises

[1] Gen. i. 28 ff.

[2] Gen. v. 22, vi. 9 (התהלך את). Somewhat different is התהלך לפני, to walk as before the holy eye of God, that is, conformably to His will.

[3] Gen. i. 27 f., v. 1.

of the doctrine of immortality, that is, the belief that eternal life also belongs to the idea of man. Thoughts which point in this direction are found in the Old Testament as far back as we can go. Even in the early fragment, Gen. vi. 1–3, it is taken for granted that if mankind had not sinned by going beyond their proper sphere, they would have had the Spirit of God "ruling in them for ever"—in other words, they would have been immortal. Consequently we have here the notion that the ideal man is possessed of immortality. In B we have found the notion that by remaining in Eden—that is, in fellowship with God—man would have had everlasting life within his reach. It is the same fundamental thought, when Elijah is taken up by God to his home in heaven without seeing death.[1] And even in A we find expression given to this belief when he relates, certainly in accordance with the primitive view of the national legend, that because "Enoch walked with God," God took him.[2] For that expression cannot mean that he was cut off by a premature death. That would be, according to the universal view of the Old Testament, not a reward but a punishment. The idea rather is that Enoch, without dying, is taken up to fellowship with God. Consequently, when man raises himself into a true union with God, he is represented as fit for an everlasting life with God.[3]

This belief that by approximating to the ideal of man—in other words, by living a pious God-fearing life—one may obtain the assurance of an everlasting life, proof against death, is still more strongly expressed in the older portions of the book of Proverbs. There it is said, "The way of righteousness is not

[1] 2 Kings ii. 1–11. Certainly ver. 16 already shows some uncertainty about the narrative. It is clear that the chronicler, even if Ewald should be right in maintaining that he does not contradict the whole story (which appears to me not likely), passes it over in complete silence.

[2] Gen. v. 21–24 (לקח אתו אלהים).

[3] Besides, in the Izdubar epic, one may read quite a similar story about the hero in the legend of the flood, whom God loved. Here also our writers had perhaps before them elements of Chaldean legend.

death,"[1] and "with the death of the wicked hope perisheth,"[2] from which the opposite is inferred regarding the pious. Such words sound so strong that one might almost think they teach a doctrine of immortality. But the more closely one examines the language of the book and its use of the concepts "death" and "life," the more cautious will one become in dealing with such statements. The thought that death as a judgment, or a visitation of providence, can, in certain given cases, be avoided by wisdom, righteousness, and piety, which disarm the wrath of God, is often expressed in words[3] so similar that, even from the passages quoted, one cannot with safety infer more than this,—that, with the thought of fellowship with God and of close approximation to the ideal of man, there is involuntarily connected, and that too occasionally with surprising vividness, the consciousness of an eternal life that does not succumb to death. Nor is there anything more than this implied in the Psalms which fall to be considered in connection with this question, viz. Ps. xvi. and xvii.[4]

The singer of Psalm xvi. describes in the first four verses his relation to God and to earthly parties. God he regards as his highest good. To earthly parties his relation is such that he says "of the saints who are in the land," "they are the excellent in whom is all my delight;" and that he exclaims in sharp antithesis to this—

> "May their sorrows be multiplied who woo other gods:
> I would rather pour out blood than offer them drink-offerings,
> And their names I will not take upon my lips."

In the next four verses he asserts with his whole heart that this position which he has taken up, and all that follows from it, he has found to be the most desirable and delightful course which his soul could have chosen, so that he thanks

[1] Prov. xii. 28.
[2] Prov. xi. 7; cf. xiv. 32.
[3] Prov. x. 11, xi. 4, 19, 28, xiii. 12, 14, xv. 24, xvi. 22, etc.; cf. Ps. xxi. 5, 7.
[4] Hardly belonging to a very early age.

God and his own insight for guiding him to such a choice. In the last three verses the psalmist gives expression to this feeling of satisfaction, security, and joy:

> "Therefore my heart is glad, and my soul rejoiceth:
> My flesh also rests securely.
> For Thou dost not give my soul over to Sheol;
> Neither dost Thou suffer Thy loved ones to see the pit.
> Thou showest me the path of life:
> In Thy presence is fulness of joy;
> In Thy right hand there are pleasures for evermore."

As God's friend, the singer is confident that he may defy death; he feels sure that God will not forsake him, will not give him over to death; that he may, on the contrary, rejoice, untroubled by fear or anxiety, in the happiness which results from communion with God, and which God bestows upon His own.[1] At any rate, there is no question of resurrection and a future life. Joy "in the presence of God" simply means the joy in God's fellowship, which is very often vouchsafed to the pious while on earth. Nor does the poet hope to rejoice at the right hand of God.[2] He says rather that God holds in His right hand joy and happiness, for the purpose, that is, of giving them to the pious. And here, as so often elsewhere in the language of poetry, the expression "for evermore" does not exclude a normal end.[3] But that there can be no question of a complete miraculous preservation is shown by the general character of the phrase, "Thou dost not suffer Thy loved ones to see the pit," *i.e.* to die. Hence in themselves these words are merely a testimony to that sense of security which fellowship with God gives a man when face to face with some danger that threatens to be fatal. Nevertheless, their general impression certainly is to give the reader the feeling

[1] Ps. xi. 7.

[2] The passages where ב is apparently used in such a sense can be shown either to depend on a verb which requires ב, as Ps. xvii. 7; B. J. xlv. 1, lxii. 8; Ezek. xxi. 27, or to have also the meaning "with the right hand," "in the right hand;" Gen. xlviii. 13; Judg. xvi. 29.

[3] נצח and עולם, in this sense Ps. xxii. 27, xxi. 5, 8, 9, xli. 13, lxi. 5; 1 Sam. i. 22, xiii. 13; 1 Kings i. 31, etc.

that conscious fellowship with God implies a consciousness of being raised above death—in other words, that the idea of man brings with it also the idea of an everlasting life which death cannot impair. Consequently, this Psalm can only tend to strengthen the impression already received that eternal life is implied in the idea of man.

It is somewhat different with Psalm xvii. In the opinion of many expositors it is meant to contain the hope of a resurrection. In this case the subject under discussion would be, not an eternal life proof against death, but the hope of a restoration to life through the coming abolition of death. This would, however, touch quite a different side of the question, a question which could only find an answer in the hope of the Old Testament. But even this is, in my opinion, not the case.

In the first five verses of his song, the poet prays, "Help me according to mine innocence."[1] In the following seven he adds, "Deliver me, according to Thy righteousness, from the bloodthirsty foes who are plotting my ruin," and then with the malice of his adversaries fresh in his memory, he closes with the entreaty:

"Arise, O Lord,
Confront him, cast him down:
Deliver my soul from the wicked by Thy sword;
From men, by Thy hand, O Lord,
From men whose portion in life is but brief,
And thou wilt fill their belly with Thy stored up wrath:
Their children become sated with it,
And leave the remainder of it to their sons.
As for me, I behold Thy face in righteousness:
I shall be satisfied, when I awake, with Thy likeness."[2]

---

[1] Thou hast proved mine heart; thou hast visited me in the night;
Thou hast tried me, and findest nothing;
While I meditated, I did not transgress with my mouth as men are wont to do;
By the word of Thy lips I have kept me from the ways of the violent."

[2] The reasons that have induced me to reject the usual translation of these confessedly difficult words, and to follow the rendering proposed by Hitzig, are the following:—(*a*) חלד certainly means duration, duration of time, and then the

In righteousness, which alone renders such a sight possible, the righteous man beholds the face of God,—in other words, he has access to God, enjoys gracious fellowship with Him.[1] This thought certainly contains no reference to a future life. In contrast to the terrible downfall of the wicked, it simply testifies to the confidence of the righteous that he will enjoy the goodness of God "in the land of the living." Least of all can "the awaking" here mentioned mean awaking from the sleep of death. The meaning of the word itself is enough to settle that. For where the word is meant to refer to awaking from the sleep of death,[2] death must be expressly described as a sleep. But the strongest reason why it cannot have this meaning is because the singer is hopeful of being rescued from the death by which he is threatened, and is therefore not expecting to die. Were such emphasis given to the hope of resurrection, his prayer would be utterly

world as existing in time (Ps. xlix. 2, xxxix. 6, lxxxix. 48; Job xi. 17). But מתים מחלד can never mean, without fuller explanation, "men of the world" as contrasted with "men of eternity," not to speak of the fact that every one would expect מתי חלד. All mankind are "men of the world." (*b*) It must be the wicked who are described as those whose "portion in life," etc. But in the Old Testament חיים never means the fleeting life of sense, but just that intense life, the last stage of which is eternal life. "Men whose portion is in life" would mean much the same as τέκνα τῆς ζωῆς, but never "children of the world." (*c*) If it really meant, "Thou fillest their belly with Thy stored-up treasure, *i.e.* with blessings, they are full of children, and leave the rest of their substance to their babes," that would be prosperity of the very highest and most lasting character, such as may indeed fall to the lot of a wicked man, but which in that case presents itself to the eye of the saint as something quite incomprehensible, as the very hardest of puzzles (Job xxi. 6 ff.; Mal. iii. 14 ff.). No Old Testament saint would ever have chosen these expressions to describe "the fleeting joys of earth." Besides, the contrast of ver. 15 requires that a mournful fate should be described in vers. 13 and 14. (*d*) What God has stored up is His punishment (Job xxi. 19; cf. xxiv. 1), of which the children and the grandchildren of the wicked man are still to get their fill. "To fill the belly" means "they must swallow it" (Job xx. 23). Hence, everything tends to show that these expressions depict the destruction of the wicked man, to which the antithesis "but as for me" also points. Still one has the impression that the text is corrupt to an extent which makes an absolutely certain exposition impossible.

[1] For this expression, *e.g.* Gen. xliii. 5.

[2] 2 Kings iv. 31; Job xiv. 12; Jer. li. 39, 57.

empty and pointless.[1] It may be added that the awaking can scarcely be understood as an awaking from "the night of terror," or "from the particular slumber to which the singer was about to yield." The best meaning of it is, "every new morning" I shall see the likeness of God.[2] He will reveal Himself to me as my deliverer. Hence this Psalm cannot be of any value to us in our present inquiry.

CHAPTER XIII.

EVIL OUTSIDE OF HUMANITY.

1. The earliest parts of the Old Testament never speak of a superhuman evil Being as the personal cause of human sin, and of the ills which humanity has to suffer. It is true that the old fragment, Gen. vi. 1–3, mentions the Elohim as beings whose interference with men places the latter in antagonism to the will of God. But in this story their action is certainly not represented as sinful, in the sense in which the later theosophy has taken it. The "sons of God" are not punished, or even censured. In all that is said about them, they are simply depicted as beings of unlimited power, but not at all as sinful. Least of all are they the representatives of a principle of evil. The point of view taken in this little story is a purely natural one.

[1] Cf. esp. vers. 7, 8, 9, 13, 14. If it be his *resurrection* that is to console the psalmist, then his prayer for deliverance from present distress loses its whole force.

[2] This would give to תמונה a meaning something like that of a prophetic vision, alternating in poetry with "to see Thy face;" cf. Ps. xi. 7. The text can hardly be correct. But it is less probable that אמונתך should be read than that, following the LXX. (cf. Num. xii. 8), we should take בהקיץ as a corruption of בחזות, or some such word (I shall be satisfied when I see Thy countenance, Thy glory).

No moral standard is applied to the conduct of the Elohim. They are "nature spirits," figures out of the ancient mythology, which have already become shadowy.

The Spirit of God no doubt works evil too, but only because every spiritual effect, whether felt by the individual to be beneficial or baneful, is attributed to God.[1] Indeed, even when this effect, *e.g.* deception, is thought of as personified "in a spirit,"[2] this spirit is certainly not an evil spirit; he simply brings out by his action one side of the divine will. He belongs, in fact, to the host of heaven which surrounds the throne of God; and in order to execute God's sentence of condemnation he becomes a lying spirit. Naturally also God's messengers very often appear as His active instruments of destruction, judgment, and death.[3] But they need not on that account be bad, any more than God Himself who quickens and kills, pardons and condemns. In such cases the moral standard is quite as inapplicable to these beings as, in the case of human relationships, to those state officials who have to discharge a disagreeable but just and necessary function. In fact, it can be clearly proved that in the narratives belonging to the original book of Kings this class of baleful, morally or materially pernicious acts, which a later age was fond of transferring from God to the evil Satanic being, are still quite frankly ascribed to the direct agency of God.[4] Nor is there any clear example found in early days of neighbour deities being subsequently changed into demons, although such procedure is so natural and necessary that it has occurred again and again in other ages.[5] Lev. xvii. 7 belongs originally to

[1] Judg. ix. 23; 1 Sam. xvi. 14, 23, xviii. 10, xix. 9 (xxvi. 19).

[2] 1 Kings xxii. 19 ff.

[3] Ex. xii. 23, מַשְׁחִית (cf. Gen. xix. 22 f.; 2 Sam. xxiv. 16; 2 Kings xix. 35; Ps. lxxviii. 49. Probably, according to Jer. xxiv. 2, "angels of misfortune" (Del.), not angels of damnation. But, in any case, there is nothing about morally bad angels.

[4] 2 Sam. xxiv. 1; cf. 1 Chron. xxi.; Zech. iii. 1 ff.

[5] Cf. the change of the Philistine god בַּעַל־זְבוּב, 2 Kings i. 2, into the Βεελζεβούλ of Matt. xii. 24, 27.

the document of A; and besides, the Seîrim[1] here mentioned are not evil beings at all, but rather, according to ver. 8 ff., a species of satyrs to whom it was customary to offer a share of the sacrifice in the open fields; and they certainly belong not to Old Testament religion, but to the highly coloured creations of popular fancy.

In like manner, the figure of Azazel, which plays such a prominent *rôle* in A's description of the day of atonement, cannot be used as a clue to what ancient Israel thought regarding evil outside of humanity. We have already shown that this name must certainly be understood as describing a mighty being, to which one of the animals presented as a sin-offering is sent, laden with the guilt from which Israel has now been freed, as a visible token that there is no longer any guilt in Israel. We have also seen that this mighty being must be conceived of as hostile to the God of Israel. But even although the whole custom were really a very ancient one, it would be of little service to us in our present inquiry. In any case, there is no question of a morally evil being which causes and loves sin, of a Satan in the Neo-Judaic sense. Even if we give the words the widest possible meaning, we have to deal only with a kakodæmon (evil demon) in the ancient sense, *i.e.* not an ethically bad spirit, but a malevolent, destructive one. Perhaps a being regarded by the kindred Semites as divine, was degraded to this position by monotheism. The idea is that outside the sacred camp, where there is no covenant with the true God, and where holy fellowship with Him is at an end, an unclean being, driven out from the sanctuaries of Israel, bears sway. Azazel is certainly "a prince (?) of this world," and, in fact, of a world lying in wickedness, unredeemed. But, of course, it means nothing more than that this world is felt to be excluded from the blessings of the covenant, and this power to be impure and vicious. From such a notion as this,

[1] שְׂעִירִים.

fragmentary as it is and certainly not a product of the forces most characteristic of the Old Testament religion, one would have no right to deduce the doctrine of a personal being who is the cause of human sin. Least of all is this the case when the passage, as a constituent part of A, gives us no guarantee that the whole custom is of high antiquity.

The only passage of an early date where there is mention of evil outside of humanity in connection with human sin and its origin, and that, too, in such a way that it is represented as an incarnate principle of temptation and malice, belongs to B's account of the origin of human sin.[1] Certainly any one, who holds this account to be a narrative of events that actually happened, has not the slightest right to speak here of a principle of sin or even of a devil. Least of all, of course, ought he to introduce the absurd idea of an evil spirit (?) working through an animal. For such an one the whole account must run its course within the limits of natural history. The serpent cannot be to him anything more than the words represent, a beast of the field which the Lord God made. It is merely said that it was more crafty than the other beasts; and in like manner the subsequent punishment is closely restricted to the natural life of this animal as an animal.[2]

It is very different if we take the whole narrative as a religious myth. Then the serpent (as it was from the first, not as it became in consequence of an occurrence of this kind) is a type of the seductive power by which man is assailed, a type which is naturally suggested as soon as the thought occurs, a type not arbitrarily chosen as in an allegory, but born as soon as the idea itself. No wonder the serpent figures so largely in proverbs![3] With the irresistible fascination of its eye, the iridescent hues of its skin, its

[1] Gen. iii. [2] Gen. iii. 1, 14.

[3] Herder, *Geist der ebräischen Poesie*, i. 149 ff. Also in Micah vii. 17, it is the type of all that is contemptible, and repugnant to a healthy mind.

stealthy gliding motion, quick and startling as a lightning-flash, and its poisonous fang, it is a natural type of the hostile power that ensnares humanity. Indeed the serpent is well-nigh ubiquitous in the world of religious imagery.[1] Almost every nation sees something demonic in it, be that something truly divine, or be it destructive. Thus the conception of the serpent, as tempter, is found in the mysteries of Demeter as well as in the primitive legends of Persia.[2] It is called by the Greeks[3] as well as by the Phœnicians "the fieriest and most spiritual of all animals," and by the Cretans "divine," the symbol of spiritual power and the highest wisdom, the giver of oracles. Among the Romans it is the incarnation of genius. And this thought is found even among the primitive religions of Africa and America. Hence we may confidently assume that the narrator meant the serpent to symbolise a seducing power, a view which the post-canonical age of Judaism considered to be self-evident.[4]

At all events there is absolutely no question of a personal evil being. Symbols may represent a power or a principle, but not an individual. Least of all is it a question of a being that has become evil. The serpent is one of the animals which the Lord God made, and is simply craftier than the others. The whole story receives a solution as simple as it is religiously suggestive, when we think of the serpent as embodying the power of temptation, as it must present itself to men apart from their actual shortcomings and sins. Animal life as endowed with egoism and sensuous

[1] Cf. *e.g.* Nöldeke, "Die Schlange nach arabischem Volksglauben" (*Zeitschr. für Völkerpsychologie*, von Lazarus and Steinthal, 1860, i. 412 ff.) Baudissin, "Studien zur semitischen Religionsgeschichte," Heft i. Abth. 4 (*Symbolik der Schlange*).

[2] Schelling, Abth. ii. Bd. i. Windischmann, *Zoroastrische Studien*, ed. Spiegel, 1863.

[3] Cf. Welcker, *l.c.* i. 63. Porphyrius in Eusebius, *Praep. ev.*, ed. Dind. i. 50. Philo, *Fragm.* 9.

[4] Wisd. Sol. ii. 24; Rev. xx. 2.

appetites, is ordained and willed by God in so far as it is animal, and is therefore good. It is, in fact, the highest class of created being; and without it neither individual existence nor development is possible. Now, as soon as this sort of life confronts man, who has been created for a personal, spiritual life, it must become to him a principle of temptation. It must confront him. For growing up as he does out of animal life, he cannot but hear the voice of animal instinct inciting him to rebel against the moral law of obedience and of that moderation in enjoyment, on which depends the development of his life as willed by God. Consequently, though this instinct of the flesh, of the animal life, is good as implanted by God, and when in a non-personal creature, it necessarily becomes for man the principle of temptation. It makes him hate the limits imposed upon his enjoyment as a burdensome check upon self, which he feels to be an irksome restraint. It represents the limits which God has fixed for man as due to God's envy and jealousy of his full and complete development. It makes the transient, inferior good appear the highest, and gives it, as being forbidden, a charm which, of itself, it would never have.[1] Thus here also there is nothing about a personal, morally evil power, hostile to God. As for the principle of a material, selfish, that is, animal life, how it must of necessity become an annoyance and a temptation to man,—how it will set him at variance with God and His law, and through a lie seemingly founded on divine truth deceive him as to his true goal and his eternal happiness,—all that is here embodied in an incomparably beautiful manner in the serpent, which is at home even in Eden, and which, as an animal created by God, is neither fallen nor evil, but becomes the cunning and deceitful seducer of man.

2. We undoubtedly find that, about the time of the Exile, stronger expression is given to the idea of superhuman powers antagonistic to the advance of the kingdom of God.

[1] Gen. iii. 1, 4, 5.

The gods of the heathen world appear in a form that closely approximates to the notion of malevolent powers hostile to the salvation and sovereignty of God.[1] And when the post-exilic prophet speaks of a judgment on the host of heaven,[2] the stars must have been, after the Exile, regarded as the tutelary gods of the hostile kingdoms, who are rebels against God but not possessed of equal might. Still their struggle is, properly speaking, one not of morals but of might; and the passage is a very late one. And it is of equally little religious significance that here and there in the exilic books we meet with ghosts and apparitions, such as originated in the imaginations of other oriental nations, and gradually took hold of the Jewish imagination also.[3] Such mention of them, as well as the naïve use of mythological imagery,[4] is simply a testimony to the influence, upon these writers, of the language and the poetry of the people.

In the literature later than the eighth century there are really only two passages that bear on our question, viz. the prologue to Job and the third chapter of Zechariah. In both, an individual superhuman personage is mentioned, who stands in the closest relation to temptation and evil, viz. Satan. This name, which occurs in some other passages of Hebrew literature, expresses at any rate the idea of hostility.[5] Satan

[1] שֵׁדִים. Certainly, even in Assyrian, Shidu denotes not the gods in general but demonic beings. In such passages, however, as Deut. xxxii. 17 and Ps. cvi. 37, the heathen gods and demons seem to merge into one another. Azazel is also an instance of the same kind (Baudissin, 133, 140).

[2] B. J. xxiv. 21 ff. Closely akin is the judgment inflicted on the gods of Egypt (Exod. xii. 12; cf. Isa. xix. 1).

[3] B. J. xiii. 21, xxxiv. 14. The שְׂעִירִים of Lev. xvii. 7 are also in the same category. The צִיִּים and אִיִּים, on the other hand, are probably wild beasts of the desert.

[4] *E.g.* Job ix. 13.

[5] הַשָּׂטָן. For the word, cf. especially Num. xxii. 22, 32, where "the angel of God places himself right in Balaam's way" לְשָׂטָן לוֹ, or 1 Sam. xxix. 4; 2 Sam. xix. 23 (Matt. xvi. 23); 1 Kings v. 18, xi. 14, 23, 25. If the book of Job were post-exilic, the working out of this conception might be connected with the development of thought to which Israel was led by becoming acquainted with the conceptions of Inner Asia.

may therefore be taken as the adversary of human happiness and virtue. Both the above passages we must now submit to a somewhat careful examination.

Satan, and the activity he displays in opposing the saint, belong probably to the mythical material, by the use of which the book of Job has been made the work of art that it is. At least it is in favour of this view that, in the purely poetical part of the book, no more attention is paid to him. Among the sons of God who gather round the kingly throne of the Most High—who are, in other words, His most confidential and privileged servants,—Satan also finds a place. He is responsible to God; he does not act without His permission, and consequently he is never really censured by Him.[1] He is, therefore, in the service of God, is included in the divine will and in the circle of divine providence. He goes to and fro in the earth, on the outlook for human sin. Whatever he does, God does through him.[2] Consequently there seems to be in this Satan nothing more than in the angels of God who hurt and destroy. God's own sentences of condemnation and punishment are carried out by His messengers, who are not on that account a whit less good themselves, and least of all are they meant to represent a principle of sin antagonistic to God.[3]

Nevertheless, in the view of the poet, it is perfectly clear that Satan is not merely one who executes the will of God from a standpoint of moral indifference, obediently fulfilling all commissions, however sad their nature. His own personal wishes and will are on the side of evil and temptation. He "beguiles" God into destroying Job without cause. He envies and hates man as the object of God's love and trust. He wishes to destroy faith, seeking to break the bond which

[1] Cf. Job i. 6–12, ii. 1–6.

[2] Job i. 12, 16, 21, ii. 5, 7.

[3] Cf. *e.g.* Job xxxiii. 22, "the destroyers," or 2 Kings xix. 35; Ps. lxxviii. 49, etc.

unites the saint to God, so that he may "curse God to his face." Unselfish piety is for him a subject of ridicule.[1] No doubt he ventures to approach man to tempt him, only because God, in His zeal and wisdom, wishes to put man's unproved piety to the test, just as the serpent is in Paradise itself by divine permission. But while temptation is meant, according to God's plan of salvation, to strengthen faith, Satan intends it to drive the saint to despair.[2] Consequently there is no doubt that Satan's personal being and will are thought of as closely connected with his baneful activity as a tempter.

The passage in Zechariah is of a similar character. In a night vision the prophet sees the high priest—that is, the representative of Israel's reconciliation with God—standing before God in the filthy garments which an accused person wears, and Satan beside him as accuser.[3] In holy indignation God repels the accusation, "The Lord rebuke thee, O Satan; is not this a brand plucked from the fire?" Had the accusation been received, then God's newly awakened mercy and the recently effected restoration of Israel would have all been in vain.

Consequently here also Satan is one of God's servants,—but the one who, in opposition to the divine love and mercy, would fain bring to nought the saving fellowship of man with God,—in this instance, Israel's state of reconciliation as embodied in the high priest. His plea is the antagonism existing between the divine being and human sin, the weakness and sinfulness of the creature and his liability to temptation. He would fain cut him off from the mercy of God and hand him over to divine justice, which would have to destroy him without mercy.

Hence, in neither passage, is Satan a being antagonistic to God, and equal to Him, as is the idea of dualism. Strictly

[1] Job i. 9 ff., ii. 3 ff.

[2] Job i. 12, ii. 6.

[3] Cf. the phrases in Ps. cix. 6, "Let Satan stand at his right hand."

speaking, indeed, he is not even a being who acts in opposition to the will of God, or attempts to contend with Him. He is one of the superhuman servants of God, and is submissive to His will, "merely a peculiar figure taken from the angelology of that age" (Baumgarten-Crusius). Least of all is there any idea of a fallen being, who has by rebellion broken his original communion with God. Nor is it to be forgotten that both passages are poetical throughout, and not intended to teach anything dogmatic as to a Satan. Neither is it altogether out of place to refer by way of illustration to the accusers at Asiatic courts, for indeed two passages in Ezekiel speak of "those who bring iniquity to remembrance."[1]

But these passages at any rate show that there was a desire to exempt God from the acts of temptation, mischief, and destruction that are a necessary part of divine jurisdiction, and in the last resort good, and to ascribe them to a special being subordinate to Him, who was then conceived of as personally fitted for such an office, and as performing its duties with zest and pleasure. This tendency is seen more fully developed when, in Chronicles, it is no longer God Himself, who in His anger induces David to number the people, but Satan who misleads David in this matter.[2] And while in Job and Zechariah the name Satan is always found with the article, in Chronicles it occurs without the article as a proper name.

3. We may now summarise the result of our investigation as to the Old Testament doctrine of "the devil" as follows:— As the doctrine of angels is based partly on the Elohim of the old nature-religion, and partly on the idea of divine revelation, and, in the broader sense, of divine providence,

[1] מזכיר־עון, Ezek. xxi. 28, xxix. 16; cf. B. J. lxii. 6, lxiii. 9.

[2] 1 Chron. xxi. 1 ff.; cf. 2 Sam. xxiv. 1 ff.; cf. Ps. cix. 6. The Seîrim appear in 2 Chron. xi. 15, along with the calves of Samaria without any special emphasis.

so the notion of "evil beings" is also derived from two distinct sources. On the one hand the remains of nature-religion are traceable here also. The sons of God who, as spirits of nature, without any moral characteristics, exercise a mischievous influence on human affairs, and afterwards the gods of the neighbouring peoples who are represented as opposing the kingdom of God, and therefore as hostile to Jehovah, and under His condemnation, grow into "hostile powers." And the more Israel came into contact with the civilised religions of Chaldea and Assyria, the more the people began to think of the uncanny ghosts and κακοδαίμονες of the neighbouring nations, the more also were the heavenly hosts which were worshipped in Chaldea conceived of as tutelary gods of the heathen, and consequently as objects of divine judgment. And away beyond the holy land the wilderness was thought to be the dwelling-place of mighty beings, unearthly and unclean. This class of ideas, however, is absolutely without religious significance.

On the other hand, we have here also the idea of divine providence; and those who execute it in particular cases are thought of as "spirits," "angels," "sons of God." God works in them. Even when they deceive, tempt, hurt, and destroy, it is God who acts through them. They are His messengers, who perform His will, and therefore are not thought of either as hostile to Him or as fallen beings. But since the duty of executing this part of the divine will is specially assigned to one of these Elohim, to the adversary Satan, it comes to be involuntarily thought that he is in hearty sympathy with his office, eager to persecute and tempt men, and full of hatred to the Kingdom of God and the idea of atonement, and especially hostile to the pious and to the ministers of reconciliation. To this the influence of Persian dualism may have contributed. At any rate such acts of divine providence are more and more separated from the divine personality, which is conceived of as too exalted and pure to

have such acts ascribed to it, as was the case in early days; and they are referred to this Being, who is thereby made to a certain extent the representative of temptation and evil. But nowhere in the Old Testament is there any mention of hostility to God or of a fallen angel, or of a personal embodiment of evil.

The truly grand and religiously important conception, which stands out prominently in B's serpent in paradise, the idea of the universal power of the animal principle which is also the power of death, has not been carried further in any part of the Old Testament. It is only in Paul's doctrine of *σάρξ* and *ἁμαρτία* (Rom. vii.), and in John's doctrine of the *κόσμος* and the *ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου* that this thought reaches its full development.

In the apocryphal literature the tendency to carry this doctrine of demons still further grew always stronger. In this respect the book of Tobit has quite the character of eastern legend. A demon Asmodi, who is in love with the bride of Tobias, and kills her husband, is banished by the smell of the liver and the heart of a fish to the confines of Egypt, and is there bound in chains by Raphael.[1] The book of Enoch gives names to the princes of the evil angels,[2] and speaks of watchmen and of nature-spirits.[3] The passage Gen. vi. 1–3 is made the starting-point of a fully-developed theosophy.[4] The book tells of angels who, being identified with the stars, endure the punishment of everlasting imprisonment, because they did not keep to their proper course.[5] Satan is still distinguished from the host of the fallen angels as a power hostile to God.[6] It is the same in the Fourth Book of Ezra[7] and in the rest of the literature of later Judaism.

[1] Tob. iii. 8, vi. 7, 14 ff.; viii. 1 ff.
[2] Enoch iv. 7 ff., xx., lxix. 2 ff.
[3] i. 5, x. 7, xv. 8, xx. 1 ff.; cf. lxv. 8, lxvi. 2, lxxv. 1, 3, lxxix. 6, lxxxii. 17.
[4] vi. 2 ff., 7 ff., vii. 1 ff., xv. 8.
[5] xviii. 14.
[6] liv. 6 (x. 6, 13, Azazel).
[7] 4 Ezra iv. 1, 36, v. 20, vi. 3, x. 28.

CHAPTER XIV.

MANIFESTATION AND NAMES OF SIN IN ISRAEL.

1. In the earliest parts of the Old Testament, sin is almost invariably presented to us as nothing more than disobedience to the statutes regulating religious, social, and civil life in Israel, and a violation of the good customs in vogue among this people; but no occasion is taken to inquire more deeply into the nature of sin as affecting man's inner life. Sinners are described as persons who do things "that are not done in Israel"—in other words, things that ought not to happen among a people so highly favoured of God.[1] They are men "who work folly in Israel."[2] They are called "worthless fellows,"[3] a word which is a favourite expression in the accounts of the earlier monarchical period, and which was even personified, and came to denote destruction. Their action is called Chamas,[4] which means a breach of what is considered fair and honourable conduct on the part of a citizen. When a man does not come into conflict with the great laws just alluded to as regulating life and conduct, he feels himself righteous, an object of God's favour; and he hopes that God's righteousness and truth will protect and help him in every time of trouble. On the other hand, the old sacred customs dealing with outward life, above all with matters of purification, and in particular the Nazirite mode of life, show that in earlier times no clear distinction was drawn between (moral)

[1] Gen. xx. 9; 2 Sam. xiii. 12 (Lev. iv. 2, 13).

[2] Gen. xxxiv. 7; Jos. vii. 15; Judg. xix. 24, 30, xx. 6, 10.

[3] בליעל, Judg. xx. 13; 1 Sam. i. 16, ii. 12, x. 27, xxv. 17, 25, xxx. 22; 2 Sam. xvi. 7, xx. 1, xxiii. 6; 1 Kings xxi. 10, 13; Prov. xvi. 27, vi. 12 (דבר בליעל, בני־בליעל like בני־עולה; 2 Sam. iii. 34, vii. 10). In Ps. xviii. 5, the word is personified and put in parallelism with death and Sheol.

[4] חמס, Gen. vi. 13, xvi. 5, xlix. 5; Ex. xxiii. 1.

sin and (physical) imperfection and impurity. The importance attached to sacred form after the time of Ezekiel and A is certainly of a very different character. It is due not to the unreflecting vagueness of an undeveloped view, but to a conscious bias in favour of "legalism," caused by a one-sided conception of God's purposes. It is, in fact, an actual obscuring of what the prophetic age had seen clearly; for the meaning which that age gave to the will of God, and therefore also to sin, was far deeper and grander. Not till the perfect life of man was revealed in the person of Christ, was any advance made beyond the knowledge of sin which the prophets proclaimed. Prophecy lights up the night of sin and "the ways of darkness"[1] with the torch of the divine Spirit, making them visible to their lowest depths. And the self-examination of the psalmist-singers, under the guidance of God's Spirit, pierces even to the heart and reins, revealing the tangled web of human wickedness with all its hidden joinings. Here sin is taken in the purely moral sense, as the act of a will perversely opposed to the divine will. Physical uncleanness, being regarded as non-essential in God's eyes, is now put into the background. The Christian preaching of repentance can be directly based on this doctrine of sin.

2. In its most general form, sin is called Chattath,[2] a missing of the right way, the opposite of a straight course of conduct.[3] This name is given both to the strongest manifestations of sin and to its mildest forms.[4] The word may also denote an offence against man.[5] But in the last resort every sin is directed against God, the guardian of holy order.[6] It may be committed unintentionally and unconsciously, by inadvertence, or from infatuation. In that case, whether committed against God or

[1] Prov. ii. 13, iv. 19.

[2] חטאה, חטאת, חטא (cf. Ewald *Gram.* § 166*a*, ii. 173*a*).

[3] ישר.

[4] Gen. xviii. 20; cf. xli. 9.

[5] חטא ל, Gen. xli. 9, l. 17.

[6] חטא לאלהים, Ps. li. 6; cf. Gen. xiii. 13, xx. 6, xxxix. 9; Ex. x. 17, xxxii. 33; 1 Sam. vii. 6, xiv. 33; 2 Sam. xii. 13.

man, it is regarded as expiable by compensation.[1] Such sins of weakness, as are simply due to human frailty, are also called "hidden," "unforeseen," "secret," "sins of youth."[2] But a sin may also be committed with the full intention of violating the law of God. In that case it is "sin with a high hand," and can be expiated only by the annihilation of the sinner.[3]

When men do not conform to the law laid down by God for Israel, they are called "wicked,"[4] and are a class of man distinct from the "righteous." That this conception is involved in the word Rasha is proved by the constant usage of the language,[5] and especially by the contrasted expressions "to pronounce wicked," "to declare righteous,"[6] an antithesis which occurs even when the guilt has reference only to a single definite judicial case.[7] The linguistic derivation of the word is obscure.[8]

As contrasted with the divine wisdom, the idea of sin is developed in an extraordinary variety of ways. Only in God and in His truth is true practical wisdom to be found; and those who fight against that are fools, however wise they may think themselves, and however much shrewdness and skill they may display in securing the immediate material advantages of the present life. The lowest stage of this opposition is "simplicity,"[9] which of itself does not necessarily involve

[1] בִּשְׁגָגָה, Lev. iv. 2, 22, 27, v. 15, 18 (והוא לא ידע); cf. Josh. xx. 3, 9, the law as to the avenging of blood.

[2] שְׁגִיאָה, Ps. xix. 13, נִסְתָּרוֹת, עַלֻּמִים, Ps. xix. 13, xc. 8; cf. חַטֹּאת נְעוּרִים, Ps. xxv. 7; Job xiii. 26.

[3] בְּיָד רָמָה, Num. xv. 30 (cf. for the phrase Ex. xiv. 8; Num. xxxiii. 3 f., where the exodus of Israel from Egypt is so called in contrast with a peaceful dismissal).

[4] רָשַׁע. The verb in Qal. 1 Kings viii. 47.

[5] Cf. Hupfeld on Ps. 1. For the antithesis Ex. ix. 27, xxii. 8, xxiii. 7.

[6] הַצַּדִּיק and הָרָשָׁע. [7] Ex. ii. 13, xxiii. 1.

[8] The derivation from the rare and doubtful Syrian Ethpaal is rightly abandoned. According to Dillmann *Lexic. Æth.* p. 280, one would have to think of dirt, uncleanness. In my opinion the connection with רָעַשׁ and רָגַז is by far the most probable, so that the original meaning would be "disorder, rebellion."

[9] פֶּתִי, פְּתָאִים, Job v. 2; Prov. i. 4, 22, 32, viii. 5, xiv. 15, 18, xxii. 3, xix. 25. In a good sense, Ps. xix. 8, cxvi. 6, cxix. 131.

hostility to God, but may certainly amount to it. Next comes ignorance, based on fleshly self-confidence,[1] which in many cases it is still possible to change, want of insight,[2] empty-headedness.[3] Still stronger are the expressions, folly,[4] stupidity,[5] silliness,[6] expressions which no longer conceal a religious antagonism to everything connected with divine wisdom. Strongest of all is scoffing,[7] with its lying loquacity,[8] its mocking speeches,[9] and its cunning,[10] in which natural intelligence is degraded to the service of sin.

Contrasted with truth, sin is lying,[11] untruth,[12] falsehood and nothingness,[13] emptiness and vanity.[14] Sinners are perverse[15] and crazy;[16] their plans are fraudulent.[17] Their thoughts are deceit[18] and cursing.[19] They turn aside to crooked paths[20] and are double-tongued sceptics.[21]

[1] בסל למו, Ps. xlix. 14. בסיל, Prov. xiii. 19, xiv. 7, xv. 2, 14, xvii. 12, 25, iii. 36, viii. 5; cf. xxiii. 9, xxvi. 1, 9, xxix. 20; Ps. xcii. 7. The primary meaning is "to be fleshy." In Job iv. 6, the word simply means "self-confidence." By transposition of the Radicals we obtain the words סכל, etc. 1 Sam. xiii. 13; 2 Sam. xxiv. 10.

[2] חסר־לב, Prov. vii. 7, xv. 21, ix. 4, xxiv. 30.

[3] נבוב, Job xi. 12.

[4] נבלה, almost always in a moral sense, *e.g.* Deut. xxxii. 6, 21; Job ii. 10, xxx. 8; Isa. xxxii. 5; Prov. xvii. 21; Ps. xiv. 1, xxxix. 9, liii. 2. This word alternates with סכל, סכלות, Jer. iv. 22, v. 21; Eccles. x. 6.

[5] בער, Ps. xlix. 11, lxxiii. 22, xcii. 7, xciv. 8.

[6] אויל, אולת, Job v. 2, xvi. 11; Prov. xix. 3, xxvi. 11; Ps. xxxviii. 6.

[7] לעג, Job xi. 3; לץ, לצון, Ps. i. 1; Prov. xiv. 6, xiii. 1, xxii. 10, i. 22; Hos. vii. 5; Jer. vi. 10, viii. 8; Isa. xxviii. 14, 22, xxix. 20.

[8] בדים, Job xi. 3. [9] התלים, Job xvii. 2.

[10] ערום, Job xv. 5; Prov. xxvii. 12. Of course this word in itself has not a bad meaning.

[11] כזב, Hos. xii. 2; Ps. v. 7, 10, iv. 3.

[12] כחשים, Hos. xii. 1; Isa. xxx. 9, B. J. (lvii. 11), lix. 13 (Ps. xvii. 4).

[13] שׁוא, Job xi. 11, xxxi. 5; Ex. xx. 7, xxiii. 1.

[14] שׁקר, Ps. vii. 15; Ex. xxiii. 7; B. J. lvii. 4, lix. 3, 13; Micah vi. 12.

[15] עקש, Deut. xxxii. 5. [16] פתלתל, Deut. xxxii. 5.

[17] The bad meaning of מזמה, Jer. li. 11; Ps. xxxvii. 7.

[18] רמיה, Ps. xxxii. 2, lii. 4, cxx. 2 f., מרמה, Ps. v. 7, x. 7; Job xxxi. 5.

[19] אלה in the bad signification (Ps. x. 7).

[20] הטה עקלקלות, Ps. cxxv. 5. [21] סעף, Ps. cxix. 113.

Contrasted with kindness, sin is oppression [1] and violence: [2] contrasted with civil order and justice, it is crime,[3] wickedness,[4] worthlessness.[5] The wicked lie in wait to work mischief, and do so habitually.[6] They defy justice.[7] In a word they act like scoundrels.[8] Hence their conduct, being the opposite of all that is good, must be woeful [9] and in fact abominable.[10]

In contrast to the holiness of the covenant people, sinful Israel is unclean, profane.[11] Its sin is represented as pollution [12] and abomination.[13] It forsakes God faithlessly and deceitfully,[14] revolts against Him and His commands,[15] falls away from Him,[16] rebels,[17] is disloyal,[18] despises Him,[19] hates Him,[20]

[1] עשק, Jer. vi. 6; Isa. xxx. 12; B. J. liv. 14 (ביל, Isa. xxxii. 5, miserly ?).

[2] שד, Hab. i. 3.

[3] חמס, Hab. i. 3; B. J. lix. 6 (cf. Isa. v. 7 f., משפח and צעקה).

[4] עול, עולה, עוֹל, מעוּל, Ezek. xxviii. 18, xxxiii. 18; Job vi. 30, xi. 14, xxvii. 7; Ps. lxxi. 4, vii. 4 (חמץ).

[5] בליעל, Deut. xiii. 14, xv. 9 (Ps. xli. 9).

[6] און (פעל און, שקד און), Isa. x. 1, xxix. 20; Hab. i. 3; Ps. vi. 9, xiv. 4, vii. 15, x. 7.

[7] מעל, Ezek. xiv. 13, xv. 8; Lev. v. 15, 21, xxvi. 40; Num. v. 6, 12, 27, xxxi. 16; Josh. vii. 1, xxii. 16, 20, 22, 37.

[8] מרעים, Ps. xxxvii. 1, 9, xciv. 16 (רשעים), cf. זדים, זדון, Ps. lxxxvi. 14, cxix. 21, 51; Jer. xliii. 2, l. 31; Ezek. vii. 10.

[9] עמל, Isa. x. 1; Num. xxiii. 21; Ps. vii. 15; Hab. i. 3.

[10] שערורית, Hos. vi. 10.

[11] חנף, Job viii. 13, xiii. 16, xv. 34, xx. 5, xxvii. 8, xxxiv. 30; Isa. xxxiii. 14; B. J. xxiv. 5.

[12] נדה, Lev. xx. 21. טמאות, Lev. xvi. 16; זמה, Lev. xviii. 17, xx. 14 (23, 26); Judg. xx. 6; Ps. xxvi. 10 (Prov. xx. 23); תבל, Lev. xviii. 23; זלת, Ps. xii. 9.

[13] תועבה, Lev. xviii. 22, xx. 13. שקץ, Lev. xi. 11, 12, 20, 41, 42, xx. 25.

[14] בגד ב (בגדי־און, Ps. lix. 6); Hos. v. 7; Jer. v. 11, ix. 1; Prov. ii. 22, xiii. 2.

[15] מרה ב (מרה פי־יהוה, 1 Sam. xii. 14, 15); Num. xvii. 25; Isa. xxx. 9; Ps. v. 11; Hos. xiv. 1; cf. מרי, Isa. xxx. 9; Deut. xxxi. 27; Ezek. ii. 5, 7 f., iii. 9, 26 f., etc.

[16] פשע ב, Isa. i. 2; Hos. vii. 13; Ezek. ii. 3; B. J. xlvi. 8. (Also of political rebellion (1 Kings xii. 19). It is also used in a milder sense, Lev. xvi. 16; Gen. xxxi. 36; Ex. xxii. 8, xxiii. 21, xxxiv. 7, and more generally, *e.g.* Gen. l. 17.)

[17] מרד ב, Josh. xxii. 19, 22, 29; Ezek. ii. 3 (for the meaning, 2 Kings xviii. 20, xxiv. 1, 20).

[18] שטים or סטים, Hos. v. 2; Ps. ci. 3.

[19] נאץ, Ps. x. 13.

[20] Ex. xx. 4; Ps. viii. 3.

is faithless.[1] And as regards divine punishment, the wicked are stiff-necked,[2] haughty,[3] talkative braggarts,[4] hard-hearted,[5] violent, mighty men,[6] bent on provoking God.[7] The picture of sin is thus presented in an endless variety of ways, which the above list by no means exhausts. Everywhere it shows itself hostile to the self-revealing God, and His ordinances of wisdom. In contrast to the highest good, it represents the one principle of "evil," the sum of all that is morally and materially bad.[8]

3. The fundamental characteristic of these acts of sin is disobedience to God. "Rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and disobedience as idolatry and teraphim," as the historian makes Samuel, the man of God, declare.[9] Hence the strongest form of sin, the one that destroys the very foundation of character, is apostasy from God, the worshipping of false gods. This is adultery, a breaking of the covenant.[10] Next to it comes wilful abandonment of the ordinances by which the God of Israel desires to be honoured. By this sin ancient Israel understood the neglect of the sacred national customs. The age after Ezra emphatically condemns any contempt of the statutes and ordinances of the Law. And, however decided prophecy was in laying the main emphasis on piety of disposition and

[1] סררים, Isa. xxx. 1, xxxi. 6; Jer. v. 23, vi. 28 (Hos. ix. 1); B. J. lix. 13, lxv. 2. סור מן, Ex. xxxii. 8; Isa. i. 5, xxxi. 6.

[2] Deut. viii. 11, 14, ix. 6, 13; B. J. xlviii. 4; Ezek. iii. 7; cf. שׁרירות, Deut. xxix. 18.

[3] גאים, Ps. xciv. 2, cxl. 6; Prov. xv. 25.

[4] הוללים, Ps. v. 6 (x. 3), lxxiii. 2, lxxv. 5.

[5] אבירי־לב, B. J. xlvi. 12.

[6] גבור and רהב in an ironical sense (Ps. lii. 3, xl. 5).

[7] מרגיזי־אל, Job. xii. 6; cf. with this, "a stiff-necked people," Ex. xxxii. 9, xxxiii. 3, 5, xxxiv. 9; B. J. xlviii. 4; Ezek. ii. 4; cf. שׁחת, Ex. xxxii. 7; השׁחית, Isa. i. 4.

[8] רע, רעה, Gen. vi. 5, viii. 21, xiii. 13; xxxviii. 7, xxxix. 9, xl. 7, l. 15; Ex. xxxii. 22; Judg. xx. 12 f.; 2 Sam. iii. 39.

[9] 1 Sam. xv. 23; Hos. xiii. 2; Isa. xxx. 9; Ezek. ii. 5, 7, 8, iii. 9, 26 f., xii. 2, 3, 9, 25, xxiv. 3, xliv. 6; Deut. xxxi. 27, etc.

[10] *E.g.* Hos. i.–iii., iv. 12, v. 3 ff., viii. 4 ff., ix. 1, 10, xiii. 1 ff.; Isa. i. 21, ii. 6 ff., 18 ff., viii. 19; Jer. i. 16, ii. 5 ff., vii. 11, 18, v. 11, 19, iv. 17, viii. 1 ff., 19 ff.; Ezek. vi. 9, vii. 20, viii. 3 ff., xvi., xxiii. 3 ff.; Amos iii. 14, v. 26; B. J. lviii. 2, lxv. 2 ff.; lvii. 5–10; Zeph. i. 5; Zech. x. 2 ff., etc.

upright conduct, nevertheless in any violation of the holy mode of life traditional in Israel it always saw a wicked insult to God, and complained that Israel was so fleshly and insubordinate that he never learned to conform even to the external forms of life required by the divine will.[1] "My land they defiled, and my heritage they made an abomination."[2]

But the real complaint of the men of God is directed against the violation of religious feeling, and of uprightness and honesty in the conduct of the Israelites. In this they find the real essence of Israel's sin. Unbelief produces not only faint-hearted resistance to human might[3] and dependence on human help,[4] but also self-righteousness in regard to the divine word, through "being wise in one's own eyes."[5] Unbelief is the cause of lying and of hypocrisy toward God. The people draw near with the lips, while the heart is far away. They think to deceive God by an outward appearance of devotion, whereas sacrifice derives all its worth from faith and love. Their religion is a commandment of men learned by *rote*.[6] And against their neighbour they use all manner of deceit. Every tongue speaks foolishness and craft. They break the most solemn vows. They are false as judges, false as prophets, false as men of business.[7] Instead

[1] *E.g.* Hos. viii. 1, 12 ff., xi. 7; Amos iv. 4; Zeph. i. 8; Hagg. i. 2, 4; Ezek. v. 6 (Isa. ii. 6 ff.; Mal. i. 1 ff.); 1 Kings xv. 25, 33, xvi. 19, 26; 2 Kings x. 29, 31, xii. 4, xiii. 1, 11, xiv. 24, etc.

[2] Jer. ii. 7; cf. xvi. 18; Amos ii. 4; Micah ii. 10; Ezek. xxxvi. 17; B. J. lxv. 3, 4, 11.

[3] *E.g.* Isa. vii. 2, viii. 12; Ps. iv. 7. ⁓

[4] Hos. vii. 11, xii. 2, v. 13, viii. 9, xiii. 10; Isa. xxii. 8 ff., xxix. 15, xxx. 1 ff., xxxi. 1 ff.; Jer. ii. 18, 36.

[5] Isa. v. 21; Jer. viii. 8; cf. Hos. v. 5, vii. 10; Amos vi. 13; Isa. i. 11 ff., xxviii. 1; Jer. ii. 35, xiii. 17, xviii. 18; Ezek. xvi. 49.

[6] Isa. xxix. 13, xxx. 9; cf. i. 13 ff.; Hos. v. 6; Jer. vii. 10 f., xi. 15 ff.; Amos v. 22; B. J. xlviii. 1, lviii. 3 ff.

[7] Isa. vi. 5, ix. 16; Jer. xxxii. 31 ff.; Hos. iv. 2; Micah vii. 5; B. J. lvii. 4, lix. 3, 8, 13; cf. Jer. v. 1 f., 12, 26 ff., ix. 2–4, 7, vi. 13; Hos. xii. 9; Amos viii. 5 ff.; Micah vi. 10 f., iii. 11, vii. 3; Isa. v. 23; B. J. lix. 4, 7 f.; Ezek. xxii. 11, 13, 29; cf. Ps. xii. 1–5, xxviii. 3, lii. 4, lxii. 5, lxiv. 7, cxix. 134, cxx. 2 f.

of kindness one sees covetousness, oppression, and usury in its most repulsive forms. They are far from righteousness, false-hearted, without natural affection, without compassion. Trust and love have disappeared from family life. They regard not the death of the pious, they scoff at them;[1] and ceasing to serve the true God, the people plunge into every form of sensuality and lewdness, whether coarse or refined. The sin of Sodom,—pride and security and everything in abundance,—produces the same results in Israel also. "Whoredom and wine and new wine take away the understanding." The people become a profane people, uncircumcised in heart, a daughter of Canaan, a sister of Sodom and Gomorrha, only more depraved. They behave themselves more heartlessly and more shamelessly than the very beasts.[2]

Since the time of Amos, therefore, the nation presents to the eye of a prophet a very dark picture. And as all these manifold forms of sensuality and selfishness are at bottom a result of opposition to the will of God—that is, to God Himself, the whole of Israel's sin is really "a sin against God alone."[3] Hence Micah's complaint, "The best of them is as a brier, the most upright is as out of a thorn-hedge. The godly man is perished from the land, and there is none upright among men."[4] Thus, in spite of all the exceptional cases of individual just men among them, the people itself appears to Isaiah as "a people of Gomorrha."[5] Hence it is called,

[1] Micah vii. 4 ff.; Ezek. vii. 23, xxii. 3, 4, 11, 13, 17, xxiii. 37, xxiv. 6, 9; Hos. iv. 1, 4, vi. 8; Amos ii. 7 ff., iv. 1, v. 7, 11, vi. 12, iii. 9; Jer. ii. 30, 34, v. 27 f., vi. 6 f., xxi. 4, xii. 13; Ps. v. 7; cf. Zeph. i. 5, iii. 2, 11; Isa. i. 21, 23, ii. 11, 17, v. 7 f., x. 1 ff.; Micah vi. 12, etc. (B. J. xlvi. 12; Ezek. ii. 4, iii. 7), (Isa. xxii. 13; Lam. iv. 16; Job xxii. 7, xxiv. 21, xxxi. 16 ff.); B. J. lvii. 3 f.

[2] Amos iv. 1, vi. 4 ff., viii. 4; Hos. iv. 11 ff., vii. 5; Isa. iii. 16 ff., v. 11 ff., xxxii. 9; Jer. v. 7, vi. 7 (Job xxiv. 15, xxxi. 9 ff.); Ezek. xvi. 49, xxii. 10, xxxiii. 25 ff.; cf. Isa. x. 6; Jer. ix. 26; Ezek. xvi. 3, 45 f., 56; cf. Isa. i. 1 ff.; Jer. viii. 6 ff.

[3] Ps. li. 6; cf. Jer. viii. 7, xiv. 7, 20, xvi. 10; B. J. xlii. 24.

[4] Micah vii. 1 ff.

[5] Isa. i. 10 (cf. Hos. xii. 8, xi. 8, iv. 1; Micah vii. 1 ff.; Deut. xxxii. 32; Lam. iv. 6).

"the seed of the adulterer and the whore."[1] And at the very time sin is at its height, the prophet has to declare: "Even though there were three men in Israel like Noah, Daniel, and Job, they could not procure it mercy any more."[2] The people, as a whole, is such a sinful people that even the righteousness still present in it can no longer avert its doom. And the worst is that even those who ought to know God, the teachers and the nobles, have forsaken Him.[3]

4. Notwithstanding the variety of its forms, the sin of Israel is all of a piece. From comparatively small beginnings it advances step by step to its utmost height. From the most innocent forms, in which it still has a pleasing aspect, sin goes on growing till it openly boasts of its devilish hostility to God. It commences with sinful feelings in the heart, which even the good and pious still experience;[4] with the sins of youth which are chargeable to human frailty—for "stolen waters are sweet."[5] It commences with that rather innocent ignorance which God is still able to excuse. "They are foolish, and know not what is right."[6] There is a sinful state in which the sinner still feels his sin a burden, a misery from which he seeks restoration and deliverance.[7] But out of this rather animal state of nature, sin does its best to grow. It keeps firm hold of the will, until it ceases to struggle. It saturates with its poison the innermost parts of the Ego. It turns sinners into enemies of God, men who do evil habitually, and who yield themselves up wholly, with all their personal faculties and gifts,[8] as instruments of evil.[9]

[1] B. J. lvii. 3; Jer. ix. 2.

[2] Ezek. xiv. 14 ff.; Jer. xv. 1 (vi. 28, vii. 16, x. 14, xiv. 11); cf. Gen. xviii. 23 ff.

[3] *E.g.* Jer. ii. 8, 26, v. 5, x. 21; Micah iii. 1, 9; Zeph. iii. 3 f.; Ezek. xxii. 29, xxxiv. 1–11; Hos. vii. 3 ff.

[4] *E.g.* Ps. lxxiii. 2; Prov. iv. 23 ff.

[5] Job xiii. 26 (Ps. xxv. 7, xix. 13; Prov. ix. 17).

[6] Ps. xix. 13, xc. 8; cf. Jer. v. 4 (Hos. iv. 14).

[7] *E.g.* Ps. li. 5; Prov. ix. 4.

[8] פעלי און, Ps. vi. 9, xiv. 4, xxxvii. 1, 7.

[9] Ps. xxxvii. 20; Deut. v. 9.

This highest stage of sin in all its aspects is described by the prophets in the utmost variety of ways. In relation to God it manifests itself in the persistent scorn of unbelievers, of those who forget God.[1] "Let God make speed, let Him hasten His work that we may see it and know it." Thus do sceptics scoffingly invoke on themselves divine judgment.[2] Thus they say, "There is no God," "Don't trouble God about us," "God doeth neither good nor evil," "He does not see us, He has forsaken the land."[3] Then they curse God,[4] and live on in bold, reckless security, as if God and His statutes were mere empty dreams.[5] This is the stage of rebellion,[6] which in the case of Israel, His inheritance, God must of course visit with a double punishment.[7] The climax of this unbelief is the levity of despair, when people exclaim: "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die." Such sin cannot be forgiven.[8] It is equivalent to gloomy murmuring against God as the source of life, and against life itself which has its origin in the divine laws.[9]

The highest stage of sin is likewise shown by the shamelessness with which it flaunts itself openly. The fool, the scorner, despises rebuke; correction only makes him worse,[10] he knoweth not shame.[11] The boldness of its countenance testifies against God's people when, like Sodom, it openly proclaims its sin.[12] This is shown in wanton disregard of a neighbour's interests, when one considers everything allowable

[1] Ps. x. 11; Jer. ix. 3.

[2] Isa. v. 18, 19, 24; cf. iii. 9, v. 12, viii. 6, xxii. 13; Jer. xvii. 15.

[3] Hos. v. 7, vii. 2; Isa. xxx. 10; Job xxi. 14 f., xxii. 17, xxxiv. 7 ff.; Ezek. viii. 12, ix. 9; B. J. lxv. 5, lxvi. 5; Ps. xciv. 7; Zeph. i. 12.

[4] Isa. viii. 21. [5] Ps. x. 4, 11, xiv. 1, liii. 2, lxxiii. 11.

[6] Ezek. ii. 3, 5, 7, 8, iii. 9, 26, 27, xii. 2, 3, 9, 25; B. J. lxiii. 10.

[7] Amos iii. 2. [8] Isa. xxii. 12–14; Jer. vi. 10.

[9] B. J. xlv. 10 (the emphasis lies on the impious murmuring against the holy laws of God, which even natural good feeling must gratefully honour. The prophet also means specially to condemn all murmuring against the acts of God as sovereign ruler of the world).

[10] Prov. i. 7, ix. 7 ff. [11] Zeph. iii. 5.

[12] Isa. iii. 9; cf. Hos. v. 5; Jer. iii. 3, vi. 15, viii. 12.

that one has the power to do.[1] But the most terrible display of the real nature of sin is when a man delights in evil because it is evil, and loathes good because it is good.[2] Then bitter is called sweet, and darkness light.[3] Then whosoever eschews evil is declared an outlaw.[4] Then men hate light and truth,[5] and rejoice over the misfortune of a neighbour.[6] Nay more, they have no longer even the natural instinct of a brute beast for what is wholesome and good. They seek after their own hurt.[7]

At this stage, when a man takes delight in doing mischief, and cannot rest without doing it, when he is wise to do evil and "exults the more, the greater the evil is,"[8] he is of course irretrievably lost. When one has grieved God's Holy Spirit,[9] has, as it were, bidden God adieu,[10] the heart has then become insensible to every saving influence. Then it has to be said: "As the Ethiopian cannot change his skin, nor the leopard his spots, so this people cannot do good, because it is accustomed to do evil."[11] The soul of the wicked desires evil; he makes a jest of infamy.[12]

All through the ancient national legend and the national history there are found instances of such stages of sin, instances of lost beings whose souls are cut off from among their people. Such is the case when the flood comes, when Sodom perishes under the judgment of God, when Canaan spues out its inhabitants, and when God determines to harden by His prophets.[13]

[1] Micah ii. 1 (for the meaning of יש־לאל ידם "to be in the power of their hand"; cf. p. 128.
[2] Micah iii. 2, 9; Ps. lii. 5.
[3] Isa. v. (20 Amos vi. 12; cf. Matt. xii. 31).
[4] B. J. lix. 15; cf. Prov. xxix. 27.
[5] Job xxiv. 13.
[6] Ps. xxxv. 11 ff., xli. 6 ff.
[7] Isa. i. 2 ff.; Jer. viii. 4 ff.
[8] Prov. ii. 14, iv. 16; Jer. iv. 22; cf. Isa. xxix. 20.
[9] B. J. lxiii. 10, lxv. 3.
[10] The peculiar idiom in Job i. 11, ii. 5, 9 (xii. 6; Ps. x. 3).
[11] Jer. xiii. 23; cf. iv. 22, vii. 24 ff., ix. 2, 4; Isa. vi.
[12] Prov. x. 23, xxi. 10; cf. Ps. xi. 5, אהב חמס.
[13] Gen. vii., xiii. 13, xv. 16, xviii., xix.; Lev. xviii. 24 ff.; Num. xvi.; Isa. vi.

CHAPTER XV.

THE UNIVERSALITY OF SIN AND ITS ORIGIN.

LITERATURE.—G. Baur, "Die alttestamentlichen und die griechischen Vorstellungen vom Sündenfall" (*Stud. und Krit.* 1848, i. 320 ff.).

Universality of Sin.

1. The earlier writings of the Old Testament take into consideration individual transgressions of law and custom; and where nothing of the kind occurs, they speak simply of innocence and righteousness.[1] In view of the terrible degeneracy of God's people, the prophets have to deal, in their teaching, with practical repentance, not with a theoretical exposition of human sinfulness, or with proofs of its universality. They censure all violations of the natural sense of justice and equity, and demand obedience to its claims.[2] Even A's delineation of the early ages nowhere attributes "sin" to the men of God of those days, but speaks of righteous men whose careers were unblemished, and who "walked with God."[3] Consequently we should seek in vain in the Old Testament for a "doctrine of the universality of human sin." But, from the very first, such universality is undoubtedly taken for granted. Even those who are righteous and godly in the midst of the general depravity are not thought of as sinless in the sense which evangelical theology attaches to that term. Even Job, who is acknowledged by God Himself to be righteous, is not to be thought of as free from moral imperfection, for "even His angels God chargeth with folly."[4] And saints, such as the author of

[1] Ps. vii. 9, xviii. 21 ff. [2] In Amos v. 7, vi. 12, viii. 8; cf. Duhm, p. 116.
[3] Gen. vi. 9 (v. 22) (תמים, צדיק).
[4] Job i. 1, 8, ii. 3; cf. iv. 18 ff., xiv. 4 ff.

Psalm xxxii., who glory in the mercy of God, know well of a heavy load of guilt which burdened their hearts till they found mercy through repentance and confession. In fact, they advise all the pious to follow their example and draw nigh to God in penitence, and with sincere confession.[1] They therefore take it for granted that every saint has cause to repent and confess. The popular philosophy, too, recognises in sin something quite "human."[2]

The narrator B has laid special emphasis on the universality of sin, just as he generally pays much greater attention to moral and religious matters than the other historians of the Old Testament. In his account, the sin of Adam, in conformity with the natural power of an accomplished fact, becomes, in the second generation, fratricide.[3] The descendants of Seth, indeed, exhibit a better disposition than the line of Cain, in which, owing to civilisation, sin develops a haughty confidence in their power of self-defence, and such a desire for mastery that they are ready for anything.[4] But in God's eyes the whole result is, that "the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of his heart was only evil continually,"[5] in other words, that the whole world of man's wishes, plans, and inclinations, was constantly and exclusively bent on thwarting God. And after the terrible judgment of the flood, the second race of men is much the same. God resolves to bear with them. He will no more mete out to them mere rigid justice, "for the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth"[6]—that is to say, man cannot bear to be strictly judged by the standard of the divine demands. Undoubtedly, sin is not restricted here to individual acts of will, but is regarded as a bias which every one inherits as part of ordinary human nature—

[1] Ps. xxxii. 3 ff. (6, כל־חסיד).
[2] Prov. xv. 33, xx. 9.
[3] Gen. iv. 8.
[4] Gen. iv. 23 f.
[5] Gen vi. 5.
[6] Gen. viii. 21.

in other words, as original sin. It is in keeping with this that, according to B, every one requires the grace of God. Thus, Noah finds "grace in the eyes of the Lord."[1] His sacrifice secures favour for the new race of men.[2] And of Abraham, Isaac, and especially of Jacob, sins are candidly recorded.[3]

In B, accordingly, it is taken for granted that sin is universal, just as we read in Proverbs: "Who can say, I have made my heart clean, I am pure from my sin?"[4] And because God is righteous, He cannot apply to men like these the standard of the highest justice. For to apply this standard to such a race would be unfair.[5] On the other hand, even in B, every actual sin is represented as a voluntary act, not as a necessity or a hereditary doom: "Sin croucheth before the door, and unto thee is its desire; but thou shouldest rule over it."[6] And along with this universality of sin it is still taken for granted that there is, among men, every variety and grade of sinfulness. Contemporary with Noah, we have the generation which the flood destroyed; contemporary with Abraham, the men of Sodom and the Canaanites who defiled their land.[7] And even in the heathen world there are found, among the sinful multitude, individuals who, like Abimeleḳh and Melchizedek, rank as the equals of the men of God in Israel.[8]

[1] Gen. vi. 8; cf. ix. 21–24 (vii. 1, where he is called righteous, sounds almost like an interpolation from A. But in any case righteousness is no proof of sinlessness).

[2] Gen. viii. 20 ff.

[3] Of course it must not be forgotten that, in many cases, the ancient conception of craft and violence warrants us in supposing that the narrator had quite a different opinion of the moral character of such acts from what we should form (Gen. xii. 10 ff., xx., xxv. 6 ff., xxv. 28, xxvii., xxxiv., xxxv. 22, xxxvii., xxxviii.).

[4] Prov. xx. 9; cf. xv. 33, where the value of "humility," which goeth "before honour," is inculcated, or the passages which emphasise the salutary effects of correction, x. 17, xiii. 1, 24, xv. 5, 23, xix. 20, 27.

[5] Gen. viii. 21. [6] Gen. iv. 7.

[7] Gen. xv. 16; Lev. xviii. 24; cf. Gen. xviii., xix., iv. 8 f., 25 ff.

[8] Gen. xiv. 18 ff., xx. 4 ff.

2. As a rule the prophets speak, primarily, not of human sin, but of Israel's sin. They invariably take for granted that the chosen people are sinful. Even in the best ages they talk about a fall, a general declension from Israel's ideal.[1] Naturally they do this still more in degenerate times. Then they depict, in the darkest colours, the adultery of Israel, his want of love and fidelity, and his moral savagery.[2] And in their hymns the pious complain, that all men are liars; that there is none that doeth good, no, not one; that deceit and fraud, jealousy and wickedness, are universally prevalent.[3]

Of course there is no intention of teaching the universality of sin as a dogma. Even in Israel such words have not a dogmatic motive, but a hortatory and polemical one. The prophets take for granted that there is, in themselves and in their own circles, a very different general tendency from that of the circles against which they are contending. They speak of their own age, and not of all ages. They always take for granted, explicitly or implicitly, that there are among the people righteous men who are conscious of being in harmony with the will of God. But even these are not sinless. In circumcision, in acts of purification and sacrifice, they include themselves, as men of "unclean lips,"[4] among the sinful people requiring the divine mercy. Israel as a nation is an unfruitful vineyard, a vine without grapes, a fig-tree on which no early fig is to be found. "There is not a single godly or pious man; the best of them is as a brier, the most upright among them is as out of a thorn hedge."

[1] B. J. xlvi. 8, 12, xlviii. 1–8, l. 1, lviii. 2 ff., lix. 2 ff., lxiv. 5; Hagg. ii. 12 f.; Zech. v.; Joel ii. 12.

[2] Hos. i.–iii., iv. 12 ff., vi. 10, viii. 9, ix. 1, xii. 12 f., xiii. 1 f.; Micah i. 7; Isa. i. 1 ff., 21, ii. 6 ff., iii. 9, xvii. 10, xxii. 8 ff.; Jer. *e.g.* ii. 7, 20, 23, iii. 1 ff., 9, 20, 26 ff., v. 1, vi. 10 ff., vii. 20 ff., viii. 12 f., xi. 9 f., xiii. 27, xviii. 13; Ezek. *e.g.* iii. 7, xii. 2, v. 5 f., xxiii. 1 ff., 46, xvi., xx. 13 ff.

[3] *E.g.* Ps. xiv. 3, xii. 2 ff., xxvii. 12, xxxv. 5, 7, 11, 20, xxxvi. 2 f., liii. 2–4, xli. 7–10, lxxiii. 6–10, cix. 1–5, cxvi. 11, cxl. 2, cxliii. 2.

[4] Isa. vi. 5.

"They have transgressed the law, changed the ordinance, broken the everlasting covenant."[1] The righteous who sigh over these abominations,[2] have to confess with deep sorrow that all the mercy and all the chastisements of God have had no effect.[3] They unroll before us the dark history of the people's sin,[4] and acknowledge that, in spite of all that God has done, the nation has but rebelled against Him in a still more stiff-necked and stubborn way.[5] Israel should carry God in his heart, but not even the priests or the prophets know anything of Him, or inquire after Him. The people despise God's commandment and have no desire to listen; eyes and ears are closed; they say to God, "Attend to Thyself." They grieve His Holy Spirit, the Spirit bestowed on the men of God. They complain that conversion to God does no good, and do not believe that God works either good or evil. They refuse to return, they are a generation of liars.[6] Hence Isaiah says: "The ox knoweth his owner and the ass his master's crib, but Israel doth not know, My people doth not consider." And Ezekiel declares that even the prayers of men like Noah, Daniel, or Job, would save themselves only, not their families, from destruction.[7] Indeed, even the exilic prophet, who announces mercy, knows full well that the people do not deserve to have their sins forgiven, but have provoked God to wrath.[8]

3. If such is the judgment as to Israel, then of course all mankind are under the dominion of sin. For, from the nature of the case, a perfect righteousness, while possible

[1] Isa. v. 1 ff.; Micah vii. 1 ff. (B. J. xxiv. 5). [2] *E.g.* Ezek. ix. 4 ff.

[3] Hos. iv. 7, x. 1; cf. Isa. i. 5, v. 1–8, ix. 8 f., 12; Amos iv. 5, 8 ff.; Jer. xliv. 10; Lev. xxvi. 18 ff. (Mal. i. 6 ff.), etc.

[4] *E.g.* Deut. ix. 15 ff., 22 ff.; Hos. ix. 10 ff., x. 1 ff., 9 ff., xi. 2 ff.; Zech. i. 4 ff., vii. 11 ff.; 2 Kings xvii. 6–23.

[5] *E.g.* Isa. i. 2, iii. 9, xxii. 12 ff.; Jer. xvii. 23, xix. 15, xliv. 5, xlvi. 17; Amos v. 10; Ezek. ii. 4 ff., iii. 7, vii. 13, xii. 2, 3, 9, 25, and often.

[6] *E.g.* Amos ii. 4; Isa. vi. 10, xxx. 9; Deut. xiii. 7–19, xvii. 1–6; Jer. ii. 8, viii. 4 ff.; Zeph. i. 12; Ezek. iii. 7, xii. 2; B. J. xlii. 19, lxv. 1.

[7] Isa. i. 3; Ezek. xiv. 14 ff.

[8] B. J. xlii. 24, xliii. 23, 26, lxv. 1 ff.

within Israel, is impossible beyond it. The heathen nations, generally, are regarded by Israel as wicked,[1] as the haughty foes of God and His kingdom, who trust in themselves and in their own strength.[2] Consequently, the sin which is dealt with in Israel is, in the last resort, the sin of all mankind. One may, indeed, speak of original sin even in connection with the people of Israel, because "his first father sinned," because they are transgressors from the womb, an adulterous seed.[3] There are particular forms of sin which are common to whole classes of men.[4] But this particular kind of original sin depends on the original sin of the race. We are right in speaking of "original sin." For the individual does not, by any voluntary act of his own, give his animal life with its sensuality and selfishness the predominance it has. He receives it along with his human nature. "Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me," is the complaint of the psalmist-poet,[5] who does not mean to represent the mode of ordinary human generation as sinful,[6] but to assert that, from the very first, the human embryo grows in a soil positively sinful. Human nature, as every one gets it as the basis of his personal development, is, from the first, under the influence of a tendency which is preponderatingly sensual and selfish. Nor can it be otherwise. Out of the unclean no clean thing can come, not even one.[7] Even Job, the righteous, feels himself entangled in human frailty which, in his unguarded youth, drew him into acts of sin.[8] There is no man who has not sinned. Were God to mark iniquity who could stand? who

[1] Hence רשעים is actually, in later times, the term for the heathen nations. Ps. ix., x., cxxiii. 3, cxxix. 4; Ezek. vii. 21, 24; B. J. xiv. 5 (ἁμαρτωλοί, Gal. ii. 15).

[2] Cf. especially Hab. i. 11; Ezek. xxviii. 2 ff., xxix. 3, 9.

[3] B. J. xliii. 27, xlviii. 8, lvii. 3.

[4] Gen. iv., ix. 25, xix. 37, 38.

[5] Ps. li. 7.

[6] חוללתי.

[7] Job xiv. 4 (v. 6, xv. 15); cf. ciii. 14 (Ps. lviii. 4, speaks of the specially close connection between the sins of habitual transgressors).

[8] Job xiii. 26 (i. 8, ii. 3, xlii. 7).

could even examine the secret sins of his own frail heart?[1] Hence God foresaw that Israel would fall away from Him.[2]

Thus Israel becomes more and more clearly convinced that man is by nature sinful, governed by overmastering instincts, which bring him into antagonism with the pure and spiritual God. But in this, as we have seen, there is also consolation. Men with such a nature God cannot judge "in His wrath." But, above all, there is here a warning to be humble. When a man appears before God, self-righteousness and confidence in his own worth are entirely out of place. He must acknowledge that, if God were to enter into judgment with him, He might bring a thousand to one. Hence, he must trust solely to God's goodness and mercy.[3] He must prove well his own motives, to see whether sin has not seduced him into such feelings as malice, the lust of the eyes, and hardness of heart.[4] God is nigh unto them that wait quietly for Him, unto them that are of a broken heart and a contrite spirit,[5] unto the poor and needy,[6] who have no renown of their own, but who look up to God. Therefore a man ought humbly to endure the evils which befall him in this earthly life, as inevitable accompaniments of an earth-born, sinful, impure existence.[7] He should recognise them as the salutary discipline of God,[8] which only a fool despises.[9] "Whom God loveth, He chasteneth, as a father his son;[10] and

[1] 1 Kings viii. 46; Ps. xix. 13, cxxx. 3, cxliii. 2.

[2] Deut. xxxi. 16–21.

[3] Ps. xxxviii. 4 ff., li. 5 ff., lxv. 4, xc. 7, 11 (Job xi. 6).

[4] Job xxxi. 1, 16 ff., 29 ff. [5] Ps. xxxiv. 19.

[6] עני mostly joined with אביון, at other times also with דל and דך; cf. *e.g.* Ps. ix. 10, 13, 19, x. 9, 12, 17, xiv. 6, xxv. 9, 16, 17, xxxi. 8, xxxiv. 3, xxxv. 10, xxxvii. 11, 14, xl. 18, lxviii. 11, lxix. 30, 33, lxx. 6, lxxii. 2, 4, 12, 13, lxxiv. 18, 21, lxxvi. 10, lxxxii. 3, lxxxvi. 1, cix. 16, 23, 31, cxl. 13, cxlvii. 6, cxlix. 4; Prov. iii. 34, xxx. 14, xxxi. 9. These "poor" are the true people of Israel (Isa. xi. 4, xxix. 19; B. J. xiv. 30, 32, xxv. 4, xxvi. 6; cf. Zech. x. 7, 11; Job v. 11–16).

[7] Ps. xxxviii. 4 ff., xl. 13, xc. 10 ff; Job xiv. 5 ff.

[8] Job v. 17; B. J. xxvi. 16 (מוסר, תוכחה, תוכחת).

[9] Prov. i. 7, iii. 11, v. 12; Ps. l. 17. [10] Prov. iii. 12 (Ps. cxviii. 18).

the godly man confesses: "Before I was afflicted, I went astray."[1] Indeed, conscious of his own weakness, a man should willingly accept chastisement even from human well-wishers. "Let the righteous smite me, it shall be a kindness; and let him reprove me, it shall be as oil upon the head."[2] Such humility befits a sinful man; it is the beginning of wisdom.[3]

4. But whence comes the tendency to sin which rules in man? If we except the narrative of B, we may assert in the most positive manner, that nowhere in any other part of the Old Testament does anyone ever think of explaining it by a historical event—by a fall. The prophets speak of another state of innocence than that of Adam, and of another fall "after the likeness of Adam's transgression,"[4] viz. of Israel's declension from the holiness offered to him. They see the roots of this fall in the self-satisfaction and contentment of the people with the possessions they have obtained, a satisfaction which makes them proud and haughty.[5] When the people became full, they forgot the Giver; they believed neither God nor His messengers.[6] This was the root of their pride and stiffness of neck, of their love of luxury and sensual pleasures, of their fear of man and insubordination,—in a word, of all the individual sins of the people. But this is only a description of a fact, not an explanation of the origin of sin.

The most of the writings of the Old Testament do not go into this question at all. In A, where one might naturally expect an answer to it, sin is simply a result of free will. God made man good. Consequently, sin cannot be

[1] Ps. cxix. 67, 71, 72. [2] Ps. cxli. 5.

[3] Isa. ii. 12 ff.; B. J. xxiii. 9 ff., xxvi. 9, xli. 17; Prov. vi. 20, viii. 13, iii. 5, 7 (xi. 2. xv. 33, xvi. 5, xviii. 12, xx. 9, xxi. 4, xxix. 23, xxx. 2 ff). Correction is the way to wisdom (Prov. i. 2, 3, 7, viii. 10, xx. 30, xxiii. 12).

[4] Rom. v. 14 ff.

[5] Hos. xiii. 6; Deut. viii. 11, 14, xxxi. 20, xxxii. 15 f. (Prov. xxx. 9).

[6] Amos vi. 3, ix. 10; Jer. xlviii. 11; cf. ii. 19, 30, v. 3, vii. 28, xvii. 23, xxxii. 33, xxv. 8 ff., xv. 6, xxix. 19 ff.; Amos v. 10 · 1 Sam. xii. 13, 15; B. J. l. 2.

explained by creation. And God reprobates sin in all its motions.[1] But all flesh had corrupted its way before God; wickedness, setting order at defiance, had filled the earth.[2] This writer who, in his general conception of righteousness and sin, points to the very tendency against which the gospel had to contend in Pharisaism, considers the essence of sin to consist of individual breaches of the commandments regarding material and moral holiness, and pays no real attention to the inner world of thought and desire.

Those Old Testament writers who go into the question are distinctly of opinion that the universality of human sin is explained by "the fleshly nature" of man himself—that is to say, by his connection with material and finite nature, which is not in a position to fulfil the divine will. Consequently, proverbial philosophy calls indolence the main source of sin, that is, the sluggishness of the animal nature which hinders the will.[3] Thus Isaiah says that he is "a man of unclean lips;"[4] and Jeremiah complains[5] that the heart is ruled by the impulses of sensuality and selfishness—"The heart is deceitful above all things, and it is desperately sick, who can know it?" The heart in its natural state is unclean: it must be circumcised before it can become pleasing to God.[6] And since man is dust, God cannot therefore judge him otherwise than as a frail and imperfect creature can bear it.[7]

This connection of sin with the earthly, fleshly origin of the natural man, is expressed most strongly and decidedly in the book of Job, where it is the view held in common by both contending parties. Contrasted with the God of Light and His perfect purity, the very inhabitants of heaven have

[1] Lev. xix. 2, 17. [2] Gen. vi. 12 f.

[3] Prov. vi. 6 ff., xviii. 9, xx. 13, xxiv. 33, xxvi. 13 ff. (xxiii. 30 f.; Job xx. 12).

[4] Isa. vi. 5. [5] Jer. xvii. 9.

[6] Deut. x. 16. If the conjecture of Hitzig, as to Prov. xxvii. 19 (מוּם for מַיִם), is right, then it is a parallel to Gen. viii. 21 regarding the depravity of human nature.

[7] Ps. ciii. 14.

defects and faults. How much less can a being formed of clay and born of woman, claim to be free from sin, a being "who dwells in a house of clay, whose foundation is in the dust," —in other words, a being who grows out of a fleshly, earthly nature into a living personality. Man "made of dust" and "perfect purity" are quite incongruous ideas.[1] Although such phraseology is primarily meant to emphasise the fact that man is not in a position to exact his rights from God, still it is also a logical inference from it, that he is incapable of doing what he ought, in the eyes of God, to do.

5. Thus the universal sinfulness of man is either simply set down as an arbitrary fact, or attributed to the imperfect animal nature of the human heart, which is due to its connection with the life of the flesh; and there is no attempt made to explain it further by some act or other of the first man. Only in the narrative contained in the third chapter of Genesis could anyone hope to find a historical explanation of original sin. For B, in fact, reports the first human sin. But he neither attempts to explain it, nor does he represent it as being in itself a sufficient explanation of the subsequent sinfulness of man. What is merely a single fact cannot, as such, have any inner moral significance for others. Nor does our narrator ever hint that the first sin destroyed the moral organism of man, and that the second man should be thought of as born with a different nature from that with which the first was created. It is only man's position that is altered, not his moral power. Before Cain's door sin lies couched; but he ought to rule over it: he is therefore in the same position as his father.[2] Besides, the first sin

[1] Job iv. 17 ff., xiv. 4 ff., xv. 14–16, xxv. 4–6 (v. 6: "For affliction cometh not forth of the dust, neither doth trouble spring out of the ground; but man is born unto trouble, as the sparks fly upward.") So long as sin is brought into connection with the fleshly nature, its purely moral character is, it is true, still obscure; it still appears akin to weakness, sickness, uncleanness. And actual sin, in the moral sense of the word, has, indeed, a deep connection with the natural side of man.

[2] Gen. iii. 17 ff., iv. 7.

itself is related in such a way that the fleshly inclination, which is in us the very essence of original sin, is presupposed in the woman before she ever sinned at all—as unbelief, concupiscence, and a spirit of contradiction. Such a narrative, if a real historical account, would be utterly incapable of sustaining the weight of the problem. It is of far too insignificant and isolated a character for that, and has too little connection with the moral history that follows. But if it is really not a narrative of actual occurrences, but a mythical form of religious thoughts, then it gives us nothing more than the ideas of revealed religion regarding the relation of sin to humanity in the abstract. It shows how, apart from the power of sin over men as known from actual experience, and as displayed in manifold individual developments, sin assails human nature as such, and brings it under its sway. It relates the fall of a hitherto sinless humanity; or, to put it better, the fall of pure human nature, as a fall is always the foundation and precursor of the multifarious developments of sin in every individual. Only in this sense can this narrative help us to understand the essence of human sin.

The possibility of sin is clearly traced back to the arrangement and will of God. It is God who plants the tree of knowledge in the middle of the garden. No cherub keeps man from going near it, as fallen man is afterwards kept from going near the tree of life. The tempter is in the garden of Eden, and approaches the woman unhindered; that is to say, temptation and the possibility of yielding to it are regarded as necessities, if man is to be raised out of the animal stage of existence. God gives the commandment, and along with it also the possibility of transgressing it; for there cannot be a "shall" without the possibility of an "otherwise." Consequently, it is by God's arrangement that sin assails man, and that man can succumb to it.[1] If man is not to continue

[1] Cf. Gen. ii. 9, 17, iii. 1 ff.

an animal, he must be granted the possibility of tasting this fruit. Without the possibility of sinning, there can be no freedom; without the temptation of becoming equal to the Elohim, there can be no humanity. Hence it is correct to say that God tempts man; as, in fact, it is said afterwards that God tempted Abraham to see whether he really feared Him.[1]

But the act of sinning is traced in an equally decided manner to the free will of man. God forbids sin. Hence it can never be explained as due to His will.[2] God punishes it. Hence it can never claim to have been decreed by Him.[3] No doubt, in a higher sense, even the free will of the creature, with sin as its consequence, may be conceived of as part of a divine arrangement; so that, as the substratum to be removed, as that which has to be negatived, it becomes the starting-point of a higher development in harmony with the divine Will. Our story does not forbid such views; but still less does it advocate them.

Certainly sin is the giving up of a condition which cannot be permanent, and, consequently, is an enlarging of the human sphere. God Himself confirms the statement of the serpent: "Ye shall be as the Elohim."[4] In deciding of his own free will to disobey the divine command, man attains to a kind of independent activity, of which only an independent, spiritual, personal being is capable, and which is utterly beyond a mere animal, which has of necessity to obey already existing laws. But this step forward involves a still greater step backward. Men get to know that they are naked; in other words, they have awakened to a sense of discord in their own nature, to a consciousness of guilt. Paradise is lost; the curse of death is decreed; further progress is made dependent on a painful struggle against the intruding principle of temptation.[5] Hence the entrance of sin unquestionably marks an advance

[1] Gen. xxii. 1 ff.
[2] Gen. ii. 17.
[3] Gen. iii. 14 ff.
[4] Gen. iii. 5, 22; cf. 2 Sam. xiv. 17, xix. 27.
[5] Gen. iii. 7, 15 ff.

in human development compared with a state of innocence without moral experience and decision; but an advance that can lead to the true goal only by continual negation of itself. Sin is in itself a retrogression from original innocence. Only in the light of redemption—only, that is, as a stage which is to lead to a higher, can sin be represented as a *felix culpa*, as a stage of human development decreed from the first in the counsels of God.

Sin is, in its essence, a violation of divine order, a transgression of law. To a being morally free, the highest good can be presented only in the form of duty or law. Consequently, its opposite, antagonism to God, evil as evil, can be nothing but a transgression of law.[1] It is not the neglect of a specific command, nor the omission to perform a higher task that constitutes the essence of sin, but the doing of something forbidden. Natural life becomes evil only when it consciously breaks a higher law. Then the natural instinct for pleasure, which is good in itself, becomes "lust;" and appetite, the instinct of self-preservation, which is also good in itself, becomes "selfishness."

Actual sin is caused by the principle of temptation, to which man is and must be exposed. It arises from his eating of the tree of knowledge of good and evil—that is to say, through man obtaining, contrary to the will and command of God, an experimental knowledge of moral opposites, a knowledge which presupposes a transgression of the law of obedience.[2] In itself the expression, "to know good and evil," simply means the capacity of forming an æsthetic and moral judgment in contrast to the ignorance of a child or of an old man grown childish.[3] Here, where it is a question of

[1] Gen. ii. 17.

[2] The view that there was in the tree itself a poison that acted on the senses, and such-like Rabbinical fancies, it should be sufficient simply to mention.

[3] Isa. vii. 16; Jonah iv. 11; Deut. i. 39; cf. 2 Sam. xix. 35; *Odyss.* xx. 310. (In such phraseology there is not as yet any clear distinction drawn between what is morally good and what is pleasant to the senses.)

human nature as such, what is meant is the experimental knowledge of moral opposites, by which man gets into the circle of free personal beings, but, at the same time, into a condition of guilt.

Sin becomes actual transgression owing to the two chief instincts of all healthy animal life—the instinct of self-assertion and the desire of pleasure. Temptation is primarily connected with the limitation of the "Ego," the tempter speaking in scornful exaggeration of the prohibition, and representing it as due to jealousy, as a malicious hindrance to perfectly free self-development. It is this temptation which first makes sin possible, as is proved by the obviously embittered tone of the woman's reply, and its exaggerated version of the command.[1] The main root of sin is unbelief, which sees in the gift of God's love an unfriendly limitation.

But what decides the matter is the allurement of the senses. When reverence for the commandment has once been shaken, so that the woman ventures to look at the tree with different eyes than heretofore, she sees that it is "good for food and desirable to look upon."[2] Human sin is, at bottom, mainly an affair of the senses, and consequently admits of redemption. It is not simply hostility to God on the part of the "Ego," but a yearning after a real, although a lower good. Consequently, it is always possible to overcome this by a higher good. Now the essence of "human sin" is partly unbelieving hostility to God and partly delight in worldly pleasure. The woman sins first. The Old Testament generally assumes that it is the woman who has the greater inclination to sensuality—a view, however, quite compatible in the best ages of Israel with high respect for the moral worth of woman.[3]

[1] Gen. iii. 1, 4, 5; cf. ver. 3, "Neither shall ye touch it" (*i.e.* the fruit).

[2] Gen. iii. 6. On account of the "desirable," it is better to take השכיל as meaning "attentive intelligent contemplation," rather than "making wise" (as in Ps. xxxii. 8), which would necessarily refer to "the knowledge of good and evil."

[3] Eccles. vii. 28 f.; cf. on the other hand, Prov. xxxi. 10–31.

Thus the essence of human sin is that disobedience to the law of God which has its root in unbelief, and is caused by temptation due to the power of the fleshly life. To such temptation, based as it is on the sensuously selfish instinct of animal life, every being that has a sensuous life must be exposed. It has, as a matter of fact, forced its way into human nature as such; in other words, it forms the common foundation of all individual developments of sin among the children of Adam. Thus sin is accepted as a fact explaining all the further moral history of man, although the manner in which it did force its way in, does not appear either to require, or to admit of, an explanation.

CHAPTER XVI.

GUILT AND DEATH.

(1) *Guilt and the Consciousness of Guilt.*

1. As far as the dominion of sin extends, so far also, in the view of the Old Testament, does its objective effect, guilt, extend. Guilt is a state of actual antagonism to the Divine law, which must be brought to an end, either by the destruction of the guilty person, or by his being set free through atonement. In the consciousness of the pious Israelite, sin, guilt, and punishment, are ideas so directly connected that the words for them are interchangeable. Sin, conceived of as a condition, is called Avon,[1] a word which in itself expresses, like Chattath, simply the opposite of straightforward, upright conduct. But as soon as declension is regarded as a *condition*, it at once becomes a fact contrary to the divine harmony, and one that must be brought to an end. Thus in the simplest way, the word Avon comes to have the meaning

[1] עָוֹן.

of guilt.[1] In this sense, which is already, in fact, passing over into that of punishment, it is obviously used in Gen. iv. 13. For Cain is not speaking of the greatness of his sin making forgiveness impossible, but is complaining of the heaviness of the punishment inflicted on him, that as "a miserable vagabond" he will be unable to live anywhere in peace and safety. Hence the expressions, "to confess one's guilt,"[2] to bear it, *i.e.* to take its results upon oneself,[3] and "to take it away," as one lifts off a load.[4] Hence it can be said "God has found out our iniquity";[5] "the iniquity of the Amorite is not yet full";[6] "to be consumed in the iniquity of the city,"[7]—expressions in which the transition is well and clearly shown. In Ps. xl. 13, guilt and sin are already quite synonymous.

The proper word for the arrest under which guilt places a man as regards God is Asham.[8] It shows with special clearness that, according to Hebrew ideas, the conception of guilt does not necessarily imply an act of free will. For the sin-offering and the guilt-offering of the Thorah, which are the sacrifices offered for such "delinquencies," are admissible only in cases where there has been no wicked intention. Now as soon as a condition arises which is at variance with the divine order, whether purposely or not, there is guilt—in other words, something which has to be

[1] Ex. xxxiv. 7. [2] Lev. xvi. 21.

[3] Isa. xiv. 21, xxx. 13, xxxiii. 24, i. 4; Ezek. xxi. 30, 34, xxxv. 5; Ps. xl. 13; Lev. xvii. 16, xx. 17 ff.

[4] Ex. xxxiv. 7; Num. xiv. 18. [5] Gen. xliv. 16. [6] Gen. xv. 16.

[7] Gen. xix. 15. It is even termed עון אשמה, Lev. xxii. 16; Ps. xxxii. 5, עון חטאתי. It stands in antithesis to נקי, 2 Sam. xiv. 9, 32. Besides, the word חטאת has the same meaning, "guilt," "punishment." So Lev. xxiv. 15, Num. ix. 13, xviii. 22, 32 (Isa. v. 18), נישא חטאו. So חטא, "to be guilty," Gen. xliii. 9, xliv. 32; Ex. v. 16; 1 Kings i. 21. Thus one brings "sin," *i.e.* guilt, upon the people (Ex. xxxii. 21). Indeed, in Zech. xiv. 19, the word simply stands for punishment. In a vividly religious conception of these things, sin, guilt, and punishment are so closely interwoven that the very words become nterchangeable.

[8] אָשַׁם (verb, אָשֵׁם), *e.g.* Gen xxvi. 10; Lev. iv. 13, 22, 27, v. 2, 19, 24; Num. v. 7.

removed by repentance or by judgment. This guilt is not regarded as relating solely and entirely to particular individuals any more than sin. It, also, develops in the case of an organism. One may be cut off through the guilt of a city without being personally guilty.[1] The iniquity of the fathers is visited upon the children unto the third and the fourth generation.[2] A single sin may bring guilt upon a whole community.[3] Through connection with sin, individuals, and indeed a whole generation, may also inherit the results of earlier sins. God punishes sinners and their children's children. The idolaters of exilic Israel are expiating their own and their fathers' sins.[4] On Israel's account God is angry even with Moses. The sins of Manasseh are expiated even by the better generation under Josiah.[5] And ill-used Israel prays, "Let the iniquity of his fathers be remembered"; "Prepare for his sons a place of slaughter for the iniquity of their fathers."[6] Conversely, just as the blessing of the father descends to the children,[7] so the innocence of a few may counteract the guilt of a community, may prevent its punishment.[8] For the measure of iniquity must be full before actual punishment begins.[9] In ordinary cases guilt is, as a matter of course, followed by punishment, unless indeed such punishment be mercifully averted by atonement.

2. How little developed the view of antiquity was regarding personal rights is also shown by the fact that God's wrath at an act of wickedness ceases—that is, the guilt is regarded as having been purged away—as soon as the law has received any kind of objective satisfaction.[10] The prophets

[1] Gen. xix. 15.

[2] Ex. xx. 5; cf. Gen. ix. 18, 25; Num. xiv. 18 (33); Deut. v. 9; Jer. ii. 9; Lam. v. 7 (yet cf. 16).

[3] Gen. xx. 9, xxvi. 10.

[4] Jer. xiv. 20, xvi. 12, 18, xxxi. 16; B. J. xl. 2, lxv. 7; Lev. xxvi. 39.

[5] Deut. i. 37, iii. 26, iv. 21; 2 Kings xxiii. 26, xxiv. 3; Jer. xv. 4 ff.

[6] B. J. xiv. 21; Ps. cix. 14.

[7] Prov. xx. 7; Ex. xx. 6.

[8] Gen. xviii. 24–32 (xix. 21).

[9] Gen. xv. 16.

[10] Num. xxv. 4; 1 Sam. xv. 33 f.; 2 Sam. xxi. 1 ff.

frequently and emphatically declare that there is in sin itself a power which must destroy the sinner. Wickedness devours a land; it rests on it like a burden, till it succumbs.[1] Iniquity is like a breach in a wall.[2] As the troubled sea cannot rest, so sin must bring the transgressor to destruction.[3] He who sows the wind must reap the whirlwind.[4] Thus the doings of a man recoil upon his own head. The wicked do harm, not to God, but to themselves.[5] The same thought, looked at more from a religious standpoint, manifests itself in the conviction that God must inflict punishment in order to assert His own will and the justice of His statutes against the opposition of man. Sins are sealed up in a bag, or, to use another metaphor, set in the light of God's countenance.[6] They separate between God and His people.[7] God is to the wicked a consuming fire;[8] He chastises, with punishment suited to their guilt, those who still go on in their sins.[9] And when once a certain stage of sin has been reached, it demands a punishment which no repentance can longer avert. Then comes the time when even the intercession of a Moses or a Samuel would be in vain; when the prophets may no longer pray for the people; when even a Noah, a Job, and a Daniel could do nothing more than save their own souls from the universal destruction.[10]

[1] Jer. vi. 19; B. J. xxiv. 6, 20; xlii. 24.

[2] Isa. xxx. 13.

[3] Jer. xiii. 22, xiv. 7, 10, xv. 13, xxii. 10; B. J. lvii. 20, lxiv. 5.

[4] Hos. viii. 7; Job iv. 8, xv. 35.

[5] Hos. vii. 12; Isa. iii. 9; Ezek. xxii. 31; xxiv. 14; Jer. vii. 19, xliv. 7; cf. Isa. ix. 18; B. J. l. 10.

[6] Job xiv. 17; Ps. xc. 8.

[7] B. J. lix. 2 (Isa. ix. 17 ff.). Sin is fire, and the wrath of God is also fire.

[8] Isa. xxxiii. 14.

[9] Ps. xxxix. 12, lxviii. 22, xxxiv. 22 f.; cf. Hos. ii. 5, 8 ff., iv. 7, 10, vii. 12, ix. 2 ff., xiii. 3; Ezek. xxxiii. 8 f.

[10] Hos. viii. 13, ix. 7, 15, xiii. 12; Isa. ii. 9 f., xxii. 14, vi. 9 ff.; Jer. x. 15, xiv. 11, vii. 16, xv. 1, 4; Ezek. iii. 18 f., 21, v. 1 f., 15 ff., vii. 10 ff., vi. 2 ff., xi. 5 ff., xiv. 14, 16, 20, xxi. 2 ff., 6 ff., 13 ff., xxii. 1 ff.; B. J. l. 1.

3. From the time of Josiah the natural law by which sin is inherited is no longer regarded as absolute. Every individual, indeed, as a member of the species, must share in the consequences of the relation to God being disturbed, and in the sufferings entailed by the conduct of the former generation. But this inherited share of guilt and punishment must not be confounded with the guilt which a person brings upon himself. The moral law of individual responsibility must rank above the natural law of heredity. For his father's guilt no one has to die, that is, to bear personally the full penalty of divine justice.[1] This becomes law in Israel. Jeremiah and Ezekiel proclaim it as a divine axiom. It shall cease to be a proverb in Israel: "The fathers ate sour grapes, and the children's teeth were set on edge," in the sense of "the son bears the iniquity of his father." The soul that sinneth, it shall die. Conversion may save a son from the death, which connection with his father's sin seemed to render inevitable.[2] Every one shall sin at his own cost.[3]

The connection between the sin and guilt of an individual and that of a whole race carries with it the conviction that so long as human guilt has not, by bold antagonism to salvation, attained a purely personal character, and thereby become unpardonable, it is invariably made up of elements, some of which are purely natural and the others moral. In other words such guilt is partly hereditary, partly personal; the former having been contracted involuntarily, and the latter by personal action. Consequently such guilt cannot be the object of the divine wrath in all its severity, like guilt which is purely personal. According to the standard of ideal human righteousness, it would not be just in God to punish it. In

[1] Deut. xxiv. 16; cf. 2 Kings xiv. 6.

[2] Ezek. xviii. 2, 4, 19, xxxiii. 12 ff.; Jer. xxxi. 29 f. Of course the converse of this thought is that a hereditary blessing cannot be unconditional either; that it, too, is lost by a man who quits the good way of his forefathers (Ezek. xviii. 10–13).

[3] Prov. ix. 12.

God's righteousness toward such men, mercy and long-suffering are necessarily included. Hence it is said in a late Psalm, "God knoweth our frame, He remembereth that we are dust."[1] And the singer of Ps. li. feels that, because he has experienced the power of sin even from the womb, he is entitled to pray, "Have mercy upon me, according to Thy great goodness."[2] That Ps. li. 7 has this meaning, that is, is intended to give a reason why God must be inclined to forgive, is plainly enough shown by the context. The first five verses of the Psalm consist wholly of a prayer for forgiveness, founded upon a penitent confession of sin. Then in verses 7 and 8, the psalmist, with a double "Lo" (הֵן), that is to say, pointing God to something which should induce Him to forgive, brings forward the two reasons on account of which he ventures to hope for mercy. The first is "As man I am sinful; my sin, therefore, is due to human nature, not to my own voluntary action." The second is, "Thou takest pleasure in frank confession; Thou hast Thyself encouraged me to present an honest and wisely-framed appeal for mercy." Therefore Thou wilt not reject me. In this verse man says on his part, what in Gen. viii. 21 God declares on His, that this earthly, natural, sinful humanity cannot bear to be judged according to the standard of divine purity. And this is still more emphatically expressed in B. J. lvii. 16. Were God to judge strictly, were He to be always wroth, the human spirit which He had created would perish. The Creator, who put the spirit of man in earthen vessels, is, on that very account, the Merciful One, the God of grace. But it is in the book of Job that this thought is expressed with the greatest clearness. With the utmost emphasis Job points out that the impossibility of man being pure before God gives him a claim to be judged by God according to a merciful standard, especially as inherited sin is, in fact, accompanied by inherited misery. It is not worthy of the

[1] Ps. ciii. 14. [2] Ps. li. 7.

great divine Creator to apply to a creature of clay the standard of His almighty power and purity.

"Wilt Thou harass a driven leaf?
And wilt Thou pursue the dry stubble?
That Thou decreest bitter things against me,
And makest me to inherit the sins of my youth: . . .
If the days of man are determined, and the number of his months is with Thee,
And Thou hast appointed his bounds that he cannot pass,
Then let him alone that he may rest,
May have pleasure, like a hireling, in his day. . . .
If I have sinned, what can I do unto Thee, O Thou watcher of men;
What is man, that Thou shouldest magnify him,
And that Thou shouldest set Thy heart upon him,
And that Thou shouldest prove him every morning,
And try him every moment?
And why dost Thou not pardon my transgression, and take away mine iniquity?"

Thus Job complains that God, knowing full well that, although not sinless he is certainly not a wilful transgressor, wishes to force him into confession, as it were, by the rack of pain; that the God who has created him is on the watch for his sin, and will not free him from his iniquity.[1] In this way the natural side of guilt really becomes an encouragement to trust the divine mercy and be of good courage.

4. Whenever a man's conscience has been awakened by the antagonism between the divine command and his own conduct, and has not again become hard and unfeeling, guilt is accompanied by a corresponding consciousness of it. This is the view in B's narrative. When Adam has become sinful, the man and his wife see that they are naked; in other words, their natural nakedness makes them ashamed. They hide themselves from God.[2] This feeling is expressed in the penitential Psalms with matchless tenderness and fervour. Conscience, born again of the Holy Spirit, penetrates deeper into the mystery of guilt than all exhortations to repentance. Here it is enough to mention Psalms xxxii. and li. On the other hand, B's narrative shows how a man tries

[1] Job vii. 17–21, x. 6-14, xiii. 25 f., xiv. 3, 5 ff.
[2] Gen. iii. 7 ff. This is the fruit of the knowledge of good and evil.

hard to roll the guilt off himself on to others, and thus escape the consciousness of guilt.[1] And in Cain, Lamech, the generation swept away by the deluge, and the inhabitants of Sodom, we meet with a stage of sin in which the consciousness of guilt is blunted into bold self-satisfaction.[2] Then God must, on His part, execute judgment on the guilty.

Death.

1. To human experience, the death of the body appears, on the one hand, such a natural effect of the transient character of all material beings that it has no particular religious significance. This purely empirical view is unquestionably the prevailing one among Old Testament writers of all ages. That men must, without exception, die and return to dust, to their mother earth, as soon as the spirit leaves them, is simply taken for granted.[3] Even in A's description of prehistoric times, death is spoken of as something quite in the ordinary course of nature. True, the antediluvians are credited with living an extraordinary length of time, such as a poet might well describe as "life for evermore." Still, it is stated of each, as the natural end of his development, that he died,[4] without a hint being given that this death was a judgment on account of moral degeneracy, much less that it was the beginning of a more perfect state.

But the Old Testament has also another, a religious, way of looking at death and everything connected with it. According to this view, death is something at variance with the innermost essence of human personality, a judgment; and whenever this personality has reached its pure and perfect ideal, it must at the same time be conceived of as raised above death.

This is already implied in the old tradition which repre-

[1] Gen. iii. 12 f.
[2] Gen. iv. 9, 23 f., xix. 9; cf. Isa. iii. 9.
[3] Ps. xlix. 11, xc. 3, cxlvi. 4.
[4] Gen. v. 5, 8, 11, 14, 17, 20, 27, etc.

sents Enoch and Elijah as exalted to fellowship with God without suffering bodily death.[1] It is implied in the Psalms and Proverbs in which the godly man, conscious of being in true communion with God, feels himself delivered from the power of death.[2] Hence everything which has come under the power of death is reckoned unclean, and must not be touched by a member of the holy people.[3] The post-exilic prophet sees death swallowed up in the latter days for ever.[4] And the exilic (?) psalmist complains that our earthly life is so fleeting and transient, just because God sets our sins in the light of His countenance.[5]

That death is for men not merely an ordinary natural occurrence but also a judgment, that it is out of harmony with the inmost essence of personality, and is due to the wrong development of man, is a view clearly expressed for the first time in the fragment, Gen. vi. 1–4. By allying themselves with the Elohim, men went beyond the bounds assigned them by God, and became as the Elohim. And this relationship must not become eternal. Man is flesh—that is, a material being—with all the outer and inner limitations of such a being. Consequently the Spirit of God, the Spirit of all life, cannot rule for ever in such a creature. Only a definite length of life, only one hundred and twenty years, are to be graciously vouchsafed to him. As in all individual material beings, so also in him is the breath of life to remain only for a limited time.[6] According to this account, therefore, death

[1] Gen. v. 24; 2 Kings ii. 11 ff.

[2] Ps. xvi. (Prov. xii. 28, xiv. 32, xv. 24, etc.), (cf. chap. xxxiii.).

[3] Chap. xxiv. (Hagg. ii. 14).

[4] B. J. xxv. 8 f. (xxvi. 19 ff.).

[5] Ps. xc. 7 ff.

[6] On this difficult passage I may make the following additional remarks. The most difficult words in ver. 3 run thus: לא־ידן רוחי באדם לעולם בשגם הוא בשר והיו ימיו. Here I can reconcile myself least of all to the conjecture of Schrader who would read נפשם הוא בשר. To say nothing of the arbitrariness of the change, the thought that the Nephesh itself has become Basar, is absolutely inconsistent with the old Hebrew mode of thought; in the New Testament, it might perhaps be possible. The explanation, באשר גם הוא בשר

is due partly to man's material being, and partly to his having overstepped his own limits by alliance with the Elohim. This is the first story of death's intrusion—the first, for it has been thought out without reference to Gen. iii. It is closely akin to the story we are now about to discuss. Only it retains in a much more marked way the features of nature-religion, and is less thoroughly permeated with the characteristic spirit of the Old Testament religion.[1]

This thought that death, while on the one hand a law of nature for the natural being, is on the other hand, for the spiritual personality in man, a contradiction of its ideal, a judgment, is worked out by B in a particularly pregnant and thorough manner. Death is threatened as a judgment

also appears to me to have little probability; for what does the גם mean? Man, as man, has been flesh from the beginning. At the most, one might interpret גם in this way, "He is no better than the other fleshly beings" (Wendt), deserves therefore no exceptional destiny. But there is nothing in the context pointing to a comparison with other beings of flesh and blood. I am inclined to think it would be best to read, by bringing forward the Zakkeph, לא ידון בוחי באדם בשגם, "My Spirit shall not always rule in man because of their sinning," הוא בשר והיו ימיו, "he is flesh, therefore shall his days be one hundred and twenty years." In that case הוא בשר would stand for כי־בשר הוא. It is quite wrong to refer the words, "So his days shall be one hundred and twenty years," to the interval of time which is still to be granted to the human race as such before the flood; and for the following reasons: 1. This fragment knows absolutely nothing of a flood. According to its opening words it should come immediately after the narrative of creation; ii. 4*b*-iv., coming in as a consecutive account, prevented this, and so it was inserted at the close of the pre-Noachic history. 2. "His (man's) days shall be one hundred and twenty years" is quite in accordance with the usual idiom for the life-time of individuals (Gen. v. 5, 8, 11, 14, etc.). 3. The antithesis, "My Spirit shall not rule in man for ever" requires the fixing of a limit for an individual life. For, as regards the human race, the Spirit of God did not cease even at the deluge to rule in it (Noah). 4. In A, it is true, there are still after the flood instances of longer life; but with A our piece has nothing at all to do.

[1] The whole situation would, of course, be very much more simple, could we assume that Gen. vi. 3 belonged originally to an older form of Gen. iii., and was only forced out of its place when "the tree of life" forced its way into the narrative of B (Budde). But however certain it is that older strata of literature preceded our present form of B, still this particular conjecture appears to me to be sadly wanting in internal probability.

on sin.[1] And when sin is committed, this judgment is executed. Man was taken out of the dust. Viewed from this standpoint, it would be only natural that he should return to the dust.[2] But in Eden the tree of life was growing. Hence it was possible that man in paradise—that is, humanity without actual sin—might eat also of this tree, and thus live, like the Elohim, for ever.[3] That man succumbs to death is therefore not merely a natural law, but also a divine judgment. In the day that he eats of the tree, he dies. Certainly, as the serpent says, with devilish truth, he does not immediately die a bodily death. But the divine truth of the sentence is duly confirmed. Death lays its hand on him; he is subject to it. Bodily trouble and sickness become his lot; and they end in his return to the dust whence he was taken. It is not, indeed, as if God had wished merely to frighten him by exaggerating the consequences of sin, or as if a change in the divine will could be made out from the creation of the woman. To be driven away from the tree of life is itself "death" in the widest sense of the word.[4]

2. From this view of death the significance given to "death" and "life" in the whole Old Testament world of thought follows simply and naturally. Death and life are the two great opposites in the lot of man. Death includes everything which is a result of sin. Since bodily death is usually taken for granted as the normal end of human life, it is only special, premature, or violent modes of death which prove its connection with particular sins—that is, its penal character,—whether it be God Himself who punishes with death, or the community which, in accordance with His command, "cuts off the wicked soul from among its people." In this sense "death" denotes the destruction of an existence

[1] Gen. ii. 17.

[2] Gen. iii. 19; cf. הוּא בִשָּׂר.

[3] Gen. ii. 9, iii. 22.

[4] According to the Book of Jubilees, Adam actually died on that day, for God's day is equal to a thousand years.

by a special judgment of God.[1] Life, on the other hand, is everything which results from communion with God—an earthly existence, never shortened by a judgment, a resting in God, a rejoicing in Him. In every period of the Old Testament this use of language is equally prevalent. We first find "long life" used to denote such lives as the patriarchs enjoy, and such as, in Balaam's prophecies, the godly desire.[2] Then there are numerous passages in which "life," "life for evermore" is contrasted with the judgments which cut men off before their time. In this sense righteousness is deliverance from death; in its ways is life. The fear of God, and the teaching of the wise, are a fountain of life.[3] In this sense the laws of Israel are ordinances, "by which man liveth;" and the law gives man the choice of life or death.[4] This of course does not mean that the godly do not die at all. But they are safe from the doom of sudden destruction.[5] They see life, they live in the light of God;[6] and oratorical language is fond of adding the words "for ever," without meaning thereby to deny that such a life will come to a natural end.[7] In spite of inevitable death, they feel themselves "the children of life," and enjoy, without the fear of death, the blessedness of an existence permeated with the sense of everlasting divine life, and well-pleasing unto God.[8] In this conception of life there is always included that of blessedness, of fellowship with God. When God makes known "the path of life," He, at the same time, makes known "the fulness of life" which is in His right hand. No one

[1] Gen. vi. 13 ff., xix. 29; Ex. xxxii. 33; cf. Ex. xii. 15, 19; Num. xxvii. 3.

[2] Gen. xv. 15; Ex. xx. 12; Num. xxiii. 10.

[3] Prov. iii. 2, 18, iv. 4, 13, 22, viii. 35, x. 2, 11, 16, xi. 4, 19, 26, xii. 28, xiii. 14, xiv. 27, xv. 4, xvi. 22, xix. 23, xxi. 21. The righteous is sealed "in the bundle of life" (1 Sam. xxv. 29).

[4] Lev. xviii. 5; cf. Ex. xx. 12; Deut. xxx. 15, 18, iv. 1, x. 13, xi. 26, ברכה וקללה; Jer. xxi. 8 f.; Hab. ii. 4; Ezek. xviii. 4 ff., xxxiii. 16; Ps. xxxvi. 10, lxxxv. 7, cxix. 139, and often.

[5] Ps. lxix. 29, cxxxix. 16.

[6] Ps. xvi. 11; Hos. vi. 2; Amos v. 6, 14.

[7] *E.g.* Ps. xxi. 5, lxi. 7 ff.

[8] *E.g.* Ps. xvii., xlix., lxxiii.

who does not rejoice before God in the "light of life" can be said to live. An existence without God, and without joy in Him, is not worthy of the name.

In the same sense, it is said that the way of the foolish, of the ungodly, leads to death.[1] Contrasted with the ripe and peaceful death in a good old age, which can be represented as the ideal goal, their death is a sudden end, through the judgment of God.[2] Sheol opens its jaws to swallow the wicked.[3] Consequently, these are not merely included as individual members of humanity in its sinfulness and mortality, but they are personally the objects of God's displeasure and wrath, "children of death," and under condemnation. It is this conception of death, not antagonism to the worship of the dead, which is the ruling idea of the Old Testament, when it considers anything "dead" as unclean, interrupting communion with God.

3. Even B's narrative connects the whole realm of "evil" with death. The woman's life of pain, her condition of slavery, as the East knows it, the man's hard and poorly-rewarded labour in his thankless fields, are represented as punishment for sin.[4] "The outer discord of nature suits the inner discord; all nature wears for man a different aspect" (Lutz). The narrative it is true does not overlook the fact that, on the other hand, human civilisation is also furthered by this evil, that the divine mercy makes evil a source of higher good.[5] But, primarily, evil is a manifestation of death, and a punishment for sin.

In like manner evil being connected with earthly life as "the plague of mortals,"[6] is regarded also by later ages as due to the general bias towards sin, which manifests itself

[1] *E.g.* Ps. xxxiv. 17, xxxvii. 38, cix. 15; Prov. ii. 18, v. 6, viii. 36.

[2] Job v. 26, xxix. 18; B. J. lxv. 20; Zech. viii. 4, as the goal of the last day. Of course, in times of special distress, an early death may be represented as a favour shown to the righteous, B. J. lvii. 2.

[3] Ps. xlix. 15, 18, and often.

[4] Gen. iii. 16, 17, iv. 14.

[5] Gen. iii. 15–21, iv. 20 ff.

[6] עמל־אנוש, Ps. lxxiii. 5.

even in the best of men, as sins of youth and secret faults. That man, who is born of a woman, is of few days and full of trouble, that the days of his years are but threescore years and ten, or at the most fourscore years, and their pride but labour and sorrow,—all this is a result of sin.[1] And so strongly does pious feeling detect in special misfortunes the special displeasure of God,[2] that the words, sin, guilt, and suffering, are quite readily interchanged.[3] The inadequacy of such a view, and the way to supplement it by a healthier conception of outward evil, has been discussed in connection with the doctrine of providence.

4. The prophets of the age before the Exile have to deal as well with the death of the people, as with its sin. As Adam "died" when he ate of the forbidden tree, so Ephraim "died" when he sinned with Baal.[4] The beginning of this death is inward sickness, from which one may be suffering while apparently in the most vigorous health—as, for example, Jeroboam II. maintained to the last the external power of Ephraim at the very highest point it ever reached. Next come misfortunes, privations, and sufferings. Instead of prosperity God gives drought, sterility, sickness, war, defeat.[5] Then the death of Israel follows. The view of the prophets as to the necessity of this death varies, as is natural, with the character of their times. On not a few occasions they still hope that they may avert it, and may require to think only of divine chastisement. But ere long they realise that it is inevitable. Judah, as well as Ephraim, comes under its sweep; and in the elegies over this death, the guilt of the people is rightly regarded as its real cause.[6]

[1] Ps. xc. 10. (This late Psalm certainly shows a penitential mood such as the early days of Israel can hardly have known) Job xiv. 1.

[2] Ps. li. 10, cxxx. 2, 8; Hos. iv. 3; Isa. xxxviii. 13 f.; Jer. iii. 3, v. 25, xi. 22, xxxii. 24.

[3] *E.g.* Ps. xxxviii. 5, xl. 13, ciii. 3.

[4] Hos. xiii. 1.

[5] *E.g.* Amos iv. 6 ff.; Hos. v. 13, vi. 5; Zech. xi. 9, 11; Jer. iii. 3, iv. 3, and often.

[6] Lam. i. 5, 8, 18, ii. 17, v. 16.

The death of Israel is the destruction of the national body. Corruption ensues. The individual atoms are scattered over the world. Israel lies in its great cemetery like a heap of dry bones.[1] Only out of these can new life once more arise. The life which God had offered to this people has been marred. Only through a resurrection, only through a new birth, can it obtain a life over which death has no power.

CHAPTER XVII.

THE CONDITION AFTER DEATH.

LITERATURE.—C. Fr. Oehler, *Veteris Testamenti sententia de rebus post mortem futuris*, Stuttg. 1846. Art. "Unsterblichkeit" (Herzog's *Realencyclopädie*, 1st ed.). H. A. Hahn, *De spe immortalitatis sub vetere Testamento gradatim exculta*, Breslau 1845. Colberg, *Argumenta immortalitatis animorum humanorum et futuri sæculi ex Mose collata*, 1752. Conz, "War die Unsterblichkeitslehre den alten Ebräern bekannt und wie?" (*Paulus Memorabilia*, St. iii. p. 141 ff., Leipzig 1792). A. Wiesener, *Lehre und Glauben der vorchristlichen Welt an Seelenfortdauer mit besonderer Rücksicht auf das Alte Testament*, Leipzig 1821. Böttcher, *De inferis rebusque post mortem futuris*, lib. i. vol. i., Dresden 1846. Fr. Beck, "Zur Würdigung der alttestamentlichen Unsterblichkeitslehre" (*Theol. Jahrbücher*, 1851, vol. x. 470 ff.). Ad. Schumann, *Die Unsterblichkeitslehre des Alten und Neuen Testamentes, biblisch dogmatisch entwickelt*, Berlin 1847. H. Gottberg Johannsen, *Veterum Hebræorum notiones de rebus post mortem futuris ex fontibus collatæ*, Hauniæ 1826, part. i. Klostermann, *Untersuchungen zur alttestamentlichen Theologie. Die Hoffnung künftiger Erlösung aus dem Todeszustande der Frommen des*

[1] Ezek. xxxvii.

Alten Testamentes, Gotha 1868. Himpel, *Die Unsterblichkeitslehre des Alten Testamentes*, 1857. Herm. Engelbert, *Das negative Verdienst des Alten Testamentes um die Unsterblichkeitslehre*, Marburg 1856. Saalschütz in *Niedners Zeitschrift für historische Theologie*, Neue Folge, I. iii. 1–89, iv. 1–86; cf. by the same author, *Mosaisches Recht*, i. p. 20 ff. Jaq. Meyer, *Disputatio theologica qua inquiritur in vim quam habuit institutum mosaicum in Hebræorum de rebus post mortem futuris opiniones*, Grön. 1835. Herm. Schultz, *Voraussetzungen der christlichen Lehre von der Unsterblichkeit*, 1861, pp. 206–248. Eberhard Scheid, "Dissertatio philologico-exegetica ad Canticum Hiskiæ," Isa. xxxviii. 9–20, p. 20 ff., Lugd. Bat. 1769. Redslob, "Der Grundcharakter der Idee vom Scheol bei den Hebräern" (*Ilgen Zeitschrift für histor. Theologie*, Bd. viii. 1838, 2). Hupfeld, *Zeitschrift für Kunde des Morgenlandes*, 1839, ii. 462 ff. Süss, *Zur Entwicklungsfrage der alttestamentlichen Vorstellungen von der Unsterblichkeit*. Albert Kahle, *Biblische Eschatologie* (Abth. i. *Eschatologie des Alten Testaments*), 1870. Die Höllenfahrt der Istar, translated by Schrader and von Oppert. Bernhard Stade, *Ueber die alttestamentlichen Vorstellungen von dem Zustande nach dem Tode*, 1877; cf. *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, p. 418 ff.

1. What has been said in the last chapter places it beyond doubt that the Old Testament view did not regard death in its ordinary form, as a rising into a more perfect condition of life, as a freeing of man from the bonds of the material world, but as a distinct loss, a withdrawal of what gives life its real value. Nevertheless, even in the oldest parts of the Old Testament, death is never thought of as being actually the complete end of existence. To think of a personal being as absolutely ceasing to be, is, for the more highly developed peoples, an impossibility. Consequently, the Hebrews, like all the civilised nations of antiquity, firmly believed in a continued existence after the death of the body. I purposely say "the Hebrews," for what we have next to examine is obviously not a doctrine

of the Old Testament religion at all. It is a popular belief, and has all the indefiniteness and the sensuous figurativeness of such a belief.

The conviction of the Hebrew people regarding a continued existence after the death of the body is shown by the fact that, from early days, the superstition of necromancy was prevalent among them as well as among the neighbouring peoples, and in spite of every prohibition held its ground with the utmost tenacity down to a late period.[1] The Old Testament religion, it is true, was decidedly opposed to such a custom. But the way in which the opposition to it was conducted proves that the belief on which it was based, viz. the continued existence of the departed, and that, too, as Elohim who, like the Dii Manes, know more about the destinies of men than the inhabitants of earth do, was as prevalent among the people as among the prophets of the true religion. Popular forms of speech, too, indicate the same thought. When it is said of those who enjoyed special dignity in their lifetime, that at death "they were gathered to their people, to their fathers," it is impossible, as is proved by the context of individual passages,—*e.g.* in the case of Abraham, who died far from the home of his race,—that a common tomb can be meant. It must mean a certain community of existence after death.[2] So, when David says, "I shall go to him (his dead son), but he shall not return to me,"[3] a similar thought is expressed. True, popular expressions like these are used in a very loose way; but still they are the clearest possible indication of the thoughts prevalent among the people. Obviously a continued existence is taken for granted—an existence it is true conceived in a very indefinite way, scarcely more than death itself thought of as a mode of existence. Life, existence really worthy

[1] 1 Sam. xxviii. 6 ff.; Isa. viii. 19; cf. Lev. xix. 31, xx. 6, 27; Deut. xviii. 11.

[2] Gen. xxv. 8, 17, xlix. 33; Num. xx. 24, 26, xxvii. 13; Judg. ii. 10; 2 Sam. vii. 12, xii. 23; 1 Kings i. 21; Ps. xlix. 20.

[3] 2 Sam. xii. 23.

of a man, is certainly thought of as lost. But still they exclude absolute non-existence. And although other sayings, where a person speaks of "being no more," appear rather to point to a negation of existence,[1] still a closer examination of them shows that they are intended to assert merely the leaving of the place occupied during the earthly life, not an actual cessation of existence.

It is a state of death which this view presupposes—a state in which existence continues, but life has vanished. Such a view is very far removed from the elevating thought of an immortality for the liberated soul, or from the blessed faith in everlasting life. Hofmann is right in saying, "It is not the body that expires and is dead, but the man in his body; that which is dead has descended to the under world" (i. 493); and later on, "Life could not be the blessing it is, if being subject to death were to be and mean anything else than a suffering of the soul and the body" (i. 495). The most complete expression of this whole notion is the conception of Sheol, the kingdom of the dead, which in very many passages corresponds to the Greek notion of Hades.[2] The word probably points to the root שׁעל, and the primary meaning "hollow," "pit," if it is not connected, as some recent Assyriologists maintain, with an Accadian word, "Shual." There is absolutely no doubt as to the meaning associated with it. Sheol is not the grave itself. For even where there is no grave, Sheol is thought of as the abode of the departed.[3] It is the dwelling-place of the dead, who rest there after the joy and the suffering of life. It is "the land of the shades," in contrast to "the land of the living."[4]

The word occurs even in the earliest writers, and it is introduced by later authors as in common use among the

[1] Gen. xlii. 13 (cf. xxxvii. 35); Ps. lxxviii. 39 (רוח הלך ולא ישוב).

[2] According to "The Journey of Istar to Hades," the Chaldeans had quite the same view.

[3] Gen. xxxvii. 35; Num. xvi. 30, 33.

[4] Ps. xviii. 6 (xvi. 10).

people, and with a perfectly definite meaning.[1] Even in early poetical pieces it is found personified.[2] As the eye that is seeking God is involuntarily directed upwards toward heaven, so the thoughts of any one in search of the abode of the dead turn downwards to where like some vast vault, "the realm of the shades" yawns wide. We may be sure that the conception of the Hebrew was not essentially different from that of the Greek poet, who makes his hero say, "Much rather would I work as a servant on a poor man's field in the land of the living, than rule over all the hosts of the departed dead."[3]

The word meets us most frequently in the Psalms and in the prophetic writings subsequent to B.C. 800, and, indeed, as one with which poetic diction may take the greatest liberties, since it personifies Sheol both as a monster with gaping jaws, and as a hunter setting his nets, and also represents it as a sea whose breakers swallow men up, as a fortress with doors and strong bolts, and so on.[4] In later, as well as in olden times, the grave is, beyond all doubt, the prototype with which the idea of Sheol is associated—not as if the two were confounded, but because, the abode of the dead being thought of as underground, the imagination naturally pictures it as a grave.[5] Even in ordinary language the two ideas readily alternate. The inhabitants of Sheol are those "who dwell in the dust,"[6] "who go down to the pit."[7] In poetry, "worm," "pit," and "darkness," are interchangeable with

[1] Gen. xxxvii. 35, xlii. 38, xliv. 29, etc.

[2] Ps. ix. 14, xviii. 6, parallel to death and destruction as a man-hunting monster.

[3] Homer, *Odyss.* xi. 488 f. Notwithstanding this "lifelessness," he too represents the shade of Teiresias as knowing the future, as the shade of Samuel does (1 Sam. xxviii.).

[4] Isa. v. 14, xxxviii. 10; Job xvii. 16, xxviii. 22, xxxviii. 17; Hab. ii. 5; Ezek. xxxii. 21–31; Prov. ix. 18, xxx. 16; B. J. xiv. 9 ff.; Ps. cxvi. 3, cvii. 18.

[5] Ezek. xxxii. 21–31; Prov. i. 12, vii. 27; Ps. xlix. 10, 12; cf. 15, 16 (cxli. 7).

[6] Ps. lxxxviii. 4, 6, cxliii. 7; Job vii. 21; B. J. xxvi. 19.

[7] Ps. xxviii. 1, xxx. 4, 10; Isa. xxxviii. 18.

Sheol.[1] At any rate, Sheol is "the lowest part of the earth"[2] into which one descends.[3] And the description of it is intended to be in sharp contrast to "the land of life."[4] It is the everlasting house, the house of meeting for all living;[5] the land of destruction,[6] of darkness,[7] of disorder,[8] of forgetfulness;[9] the land where one neither praises God nor remembers Him, nor waits for His mercy; the land therefore of hopelessness,[10] where God doeth no wonders,[11] although, according to the grand conception of a late Psalm, God is thought of as being equally present there, and equally active.[12]

Those who dwell there are, at any rate, thought of as shadowy. True, there is no clear distinction drawn between body and soul. Both are thought of as being together, although unsubstantial.[13] But the dwellers in this realm are represented as unnoticed by God and heedless of what goes on in the upper world, feeling only their own dull misery.[14] On the one hand, they are pictured as being all equally at rest, servant and master, bond and free, king and vassal.[15] On the other hand, in accordance with the elasticity of the whole conception, we still find, as is natural, a certain resemblance to the circumstances of the upper world. Even there kings are thought of as sitting on thrones.[16] And when

[1] Job xvii. 13, 16, xxi. 26.

[2] Ps. lxxxviii. 6 f.; Ezek. xxxi. 10, 15 f., 18, xxxii. 18, 21, 24, 26, 28 f.; Job xxvi. 5; B. J. xiv. 9, 15 (under the sea and its inhabitants).

[3] Job xi. 8; Deut. xxxii. 22; Ps. lv. 16, xxx. 4, 10; Isa. xxxviii. 18 (Ps. cxv. 17).

[4] Ezek. xxxii. 23 ff., 32; Job xxviii. 13; Ps. xxvii. 13, lii. 7, cxvi. 9, cxlii. 6 (lvi. 14); Isa. xxxviii. 11; B. J. liii. 8.

[5] Job xxx. 23.

[6] אבדון, often personified also as quite parallel to שאול, Job xxvi. 6, xxviii. 22, xxxi. 12; Ps. lxxxviii. 12; Prov. xxvii. 20.

[7] Job x. 21; Ps. lxxxviii. 13 (דומה, Ps. cxv. 17); Ps. cxliii. 3.

[8] Job x. 22.

[9] נשיה, Ps. lxxxviii. 13.

[10] Ps. vi. 6, xxx. 10; Isa. xxxviii. 11, 18, 19 (Ps. cxv. 17, lxxxviii. 6, 12).

[11] Ps. lxxxviii. 11, 13.

[12] Ps. cxxxix. 8.

[13] Job. xiv. 22.

[14] Job. vii. 7–10, xiv. 21, xxi. 21.

[15] Job iii. 3 ff., 13 ff., 21 f.; Ps. xlix. 11, 15.

[16] B. J. xiv. 9.

a new potentate arrives, there passes through the ranks of the shades, according to the picturesque description of the exilic prophet, a thrill of scorn and astonishment.[1] Even phrases, like "to be gathered to his fathers," "to his tribes," show traces of this idea. Such is the condition in which the dead are represented to be.[2] Their proper designation is Rephaïm. In my opinion this word, connected as it is with the kindred verb, "to be flaccid," means the pithless shades.[3] That it is also the name for an extinct race of reputed giants, originally inhabiting the country to the east of Jordan, is easily explained,[4] if the name of that people be really of Semitic origin, from the connection between being flaccid, and being "stretched out," and so becoming "long."[5]

2. Consequently a continued existence after death must have been a common belief among the early Hebrews. To prove this, we certainly do not require to depend on

[1] B. J. xiv. 9 ff.; Ezek. xxxii. 21, 24 (Job xxvi. 5).

[2] Isa. viii. 19; Ps. cxv. 17, lxxxviii. 11, 13 (ver. 5, גבר אין־איל). Most strongly materialistic, Ps. xxx. 10, עפר.

[3] רפה, רפאים, B. J. xiv. 9, xxvi. 14; Prov. ii. 18 (xxi. 16); Job xxvi. 5, εἴδωλα. (It is also found in the epitaph of Eshmunazar).

[4] So Gen. xiv. 5, xv. 20; Deut. ii. 11, 20, iii. 11, 13; Josh. xiii. 12, xvii. 15; 2 Sam. v. 18, 22.

[5] The way in which Stade finds the central thought of the popular religion of the Hebrews which was overthrown by the worship of Jehovah in these ideas, and in the worship, by the several tribes, of their dead ancestors beside their graves, which is naturally connected with them, certainly seems to me to go far beyond the inferences warranted by the Old Testament data. It is rather the case that errors of this kind are always looked on as due to the adoption of Canaanitish customs. In other respects, however, Stade's description of the popular view is probably correct when he says: "To continue to live beside or in the grave is to live on in Sheol. The dead man appears by night in dreams, speaks and acts as before, knows, when seen in a dream, the most secret thoughts of the dreamer, whom he threatens, comforts, counsels. He is thought of as continuing to exist just as he was when he died. Therefore (?) Saul and Abimelech commit suicide. Sheol is a mythologising combination of several graves. Hence the importance of a family tomb (2 Sam. xix. 37 ff.). To remain unburied is the worst of curses. Probably it was thought that an unburied person did not get into Sheol, but had to wander about or get into some corner with the servants (Ezek. xxviii. 10, xxxi. 17, xxxii. 19) (stones on Absalom's grave)." With less reason he says: "To be put out of the family grave is to be put out of the family connection, a *sacris interdici*."

passages that have been wrongly quoted in this connection—*e.g.* Gen. iv. 10, xxii. 5, xlvii. 9, not to speak of Num. xxiii. 10, where there is nothing more expressed than the thought that God's favourites may expect, not only a happy life but also an enviably happy end. But in this continuance of existence there is nothing at all to further either religion or morality. In spite of it one can say quite well, "the man is no more," "his place knows him no more." For the place which he occupied, what gave existence its value, the excitement, the desires, and the joys of life, are all gone. It is certain this was the view ordinarily held in Israel. The burial occupies the foreground.[1] It is, as it were, the last joy and honour that can be given. After it, comes the monotony of Sheol. Even the pious look forward with inconsolable bitterness to the fate of death.[2] To die early, to be prematurely snatched away out of the land of the living, is a dreaded doom. And the reward of faithfully keeping the law is, "long life in the land which God giveth," and the hope of escaping "death;" that is death as a judgment that may be speedily executed at any moment.

The Old Testament horizon, like that of the nations of classical antiquity, lies wholly on this side the grave. What is really looked forward to with joyous longing is, not one's own existence in the world below, but continued existence in one's children and children's children.[3] On this view of the world, in fact, the whole of Israel's consciousness of salvation is based. On earthly soil, and with earthly forms, a kingdom of God is to be set up by earthly means for earthly ends. And one cannot make a greater mistake as to the essence of the Old Testament religion than by trying to discover behind this earthly view of the world,

[1] Gen. xlix. 30, l. 12; cf. xlvii. 30, l. 4 f., 24; Ex. xiii. 19.

[2] 2 Sam. xiv. 14.

[3] *E.g.* Gen. xvii. 4 ff.; cf. xv. 2 ff. "The condition of death is withdrawal from the highest good. Satisfaction is on this side the grave, in living on in one's children. The godless, God does not allow to prosper in the land" (Stade).

which Moses held, an esoteric teaching, having as its centre future retribution and a true everlasting life. Of an immortality for the individual in which each was to get his due, it is impossible to discover, in the Mosaic period, a single trace. Nor is it otherwise even in the prophetic age. Continued existence after death has, in itself, no religious element of consolation or strength. Of course, when contrasted with severe earthly suffering, with the oppression endured by the poor and needy, even a life in the under world may appear a goal to be yearned after, a rest to be desired.[1] In this peaceful refuge God may graciously shelter the pious from the storms of time.[2] But in itself it is just a state of death, an impairing of life which may also be quite correctly described as non-existence.[3] And in all ages burial is represented as that which most concerns the dead.[4] This shadowy existence of theirs offers no compensation for the sufferings endured here, and no blessed life in God. Nothing could dispel the cheerlessness of this view save the hope that this state of death would be followed by another and a better life: that the godly would one day be delivered out of Sheol, or in other words, would rise again. Whether, and how far this hope was entertained by Old Testament saints, are questions that can be settled only in connection with the future of salvation. For it would, indeed, be one of the blessings to be enjoyed in the last days by the members of the kingdom of God. Nothing more can be ascertained here than that such a resurrection is, at any rate, not represented as something certain and natural for man as man. As a rule, the declaration holds good:

> "As the cloud is consumed and vanisheth away,
> So he that goeth down to Sheol shall come up no more."[5]

---

[1] Job iii. 12 ff., 21 f., vi. 8. [2] B. J. lvii. 2. [3] *E.g.* Ps. xxxix. 14.
[4] 1 Kings xiii, 22, xiv. 11; 2 Kings ix. 34 ff.; Jer. xvi. 4; B. J. xiv. 18 ff., lxvi. 24; Ezek. xxix. 5, xxxi, 15.
[5] Job vii. 8–10, xiv. 7–12, xvi. 22.

And it is only as a beautiful dream, at variance, however, with the reality, that the idea presents itself to the soul of the pious, that God might for a time shelter man in the realm of the dead, in order to prove him afterwards, and raise him once more to life.[1]

It would be different if the saints who lived subsequently to the eighth century, had cherished the belief, at least in exceptional cases, that they would be ushered by death not into that kingdom of the dead, but into a spiritual communion with God, which would compensate them for all the sufferings of their earthly life. But that must be distinctly denied. Passages such as Ps. xvii., xlix., lxxiii., would at the most promise a future redemption out of Sheol. Ps. xvi., if it is to be put to any dogmatic use at all, speaks at any rate of a complete escape from bodily death. Nothing in the shape of proof can be got from the fact that individual saints like Elijah are taken home to God without dying, because they are exceptions to the rule, and because in these cases death does not occur at all. The same would hold good of Ps. xcix. 6 f., if, as seems to me impossible, this late Psalm were, according to Hitzig's exposition, understood to say of men like Samuel, Moses, and Aaron, that they stood and made intercession before God. Lastly, when the psalmist-poet in xxxi. 6, commends his spirit into the hands of God, that simply means that he entrusts his life to the protection of God.

The one passage which is cited, with any appearance of justification, in support of the belief in an immediate and blessed union with God after death, is the difficult and obscure passage in Job xix. 25 ff. I have discussed it more fully in another place, and may refer for details to that exposition.[2] Every fresh examination of this passage, as well

[1] Job xiv. 13 ff. (19).

[2] *Voraussetzungen der christlichen Lehre von der Unsterblichkeit*, Göttingen 1861, pp. 219–223. In addition to the literature mentioned there, cf. Köstlin.

as of the objections brought against my explanation, while making me more and more convinced that the passage is almost inextricably involved and obscure, and that the text can hardly be considered correct, has at the same time convinced me that, at least in comparison with the other interpretations in vogue, on the supposition of the present text being accurate, my own is burdened with comparatively few difficulties, either internal or external. I frankly acknowledge that even it would not be quite fair to the actual words, if we had to treat them as simple prose. But the words are so unusual, that we must either admit that the text is incurably corrupt, or agree that in this case the ordinary laws of Hebrew idiom are not to be strictly applied.

The view that in these words the suffering saint sees opening up before him a spiritual life of blessedness after death is, I am still convinced, even after reading Dillmann's charming essay, conclusively refuted by the following considerations. So thorough a contradiction of the view which Job expresses so clearly elsewhere[1] cannot be thought of as possible without a distinct intimation that the hero's convictions have changed. Neither Job himself nor his friends ever refer, in the speeches that follow, to any such complete transformation of the question at issue.[2] And, lastly, the speech in chap. xix. is clearly just a *resumé* on a higher spiritual key of what has been said in chap. xvi. Consequently, unless we are to despair of any interpretation at all, or find in the words a hope of some earthly recompense in the hour of death, a hope not at all in keeping with the general development of the speeches, and one besides scarcely

De immortalitatis spe quae in libro Jobi apparere dicitur, 1846; also the commentaries of Delitzsch and Dillmann on the passage. Droste (*Zeitschr. für alttest. Wissensch.* 1884, 4, 107 ff.).

[1] Job iii. 13, vii. 21, 7, x. 21 f., xiv. 10 f. From xiv. 14 it is evident that, were Job to attain to the hope of a blessed renewal of his life, he would feel satisfied, and bring his complaint to an end.

[2] Job xxi. 26, xxx. 23.

justifiable on linguistic grounds, there remains only the following interpretation.

Job despairs of succeeding in his contest with his merciless friends. He sees no deliverance anywhere from the suffering by which he is being consumed. But in the midst of this despair he gets hold of the belief that the very God who is making war against him in the guise of an enemy is his only Helper, who will stand by him in his innocence as the upright friend of truth and piety, and will avenge him, as an avenger of blood does who stands on the grave of his friend, and vows to avenge him.[1] This God Job sees, in the only way He can be seen, with the spiritual eye, as his blood-avenger, "his Backer," standing upon his grave, after his body has been wholly destroyed by disease. Hence he wishes his blood to cry up unchecked to this highest of blood-avengers. And being certain of His help, he bids his pitiless friends beware of this avenger's sword. He sees this God on his side,[2] and no longer, as now, estranged and hostile. And in ecstasy over this new-won assurance that God will stand by him, and help him, his very heart melts within him, and he exclaims:—

"But I know that my avenger liveth,
And a blood-avenger will arise over the dust:
And after this skin of mine has been destroyed,
And I am stripped of flesh,
Then I see God (viz., as a blood-avenger standing over my dust)—
Him whom I see on my side (fighting for me),
And mine eyes behold Him—no longer hostile.
My reins are consumed within me.[3]
If ye say, How we will persecute him!
And that the root of the matter is found in me;
Be ye afraid of the sword:
For wrath bringeth the punishment of the sword,
That ye may know (the Almighty)."[4]

---

[1] גּאֵל Num. xxxv. 12; Job xix. 25; cf. xvi. 19, 21, xvii. 3 (עֵד, שָׁהַד).

[2] Gen. xxxi. 42.

[3] Cf. Ps. lxxiii. 26.

[4] The translation that seems the next best would be, "An avenger will stand upon the dust, and that, too, after this skin of mine is devoured; and without my

If this translation be considered absolutely impossible on the ground that אֲחֶזֶּה can be understood here only as a future, we have still the possible interpretation that Job hopes, when in Sheol, to live to see his cause triumph, and to witness this brought about by some divine revelation. At all events, even in this passage we find no anticipation of a blessed immortality which escapes Sheol. What all anticipate in common is primarily a condition of death, without any of the blessedness of life.

3. Nevertheless, according to the faith of the Old Testament, death is by no means the same thing for all. The difference is in the way in which men meet death, as well as in the way in which death comes to them. In this consists the judgment of death. The patriarchs of Israel die old and full of days, with words of prophecy on their lips,[1] which fix the destinies of their descendants. And even a heathen exclaims, "Let my soul die the death of the righteous, and let my last end be like theirs."[2] There is a great difference between the wicked man who is cut off by a premature and miserable death,[3] and the godly man who, even in death, holds fast to his trust in God,[4] or the poor man whom death beckons to a peaceful rest.[5] Even where there is as yet no idea of a resurrection, there is a happy and an unhappy way of dying.

flesh, *i.e.* in spiritual ecstasy, I see God," etc. That the expression is unusual and strange cannot be denied; but it is equally so, whatever explanation be adopted. Droste translates, "O that my destiny were recorded, that it were written in a book, then I, even I, would know that my Helper liveth" (xiv. 13–17).

[1] Gen. xlix.; cf. xxv. 8, xxvii. 27 ff., xlviii. 14 ff.

[2] Num. xxiii. 10.

[3] Ps. xlix. 13, 15, xcii. 8 ff.; Job xi. 20, xxvii. 8 f.

[4] Job vi. 9 f., xix. 25 f., xxii. 18; B. J. lvii. 2; Ps. xcii. 13 ff. (Prov. xi. 7, xiv. 32, xxiii. 18, xxiv. 14).

[5] Job iii. 13 ff.

(*c*) *The Hope of Israel.*

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE OUTLOOK OF THE MOSAIC AGE FOR A COMPLETE SALVATION.

LITERATURE.—J. J. Stähelin, *Die messianischen Weissagungen des Alten Testamentes*, 1847. Baur, *Geschichte der alttestamentlichen Weissagung*, vol. i. Giessen 1860. Ed. Riehm, "Entwicklung der messianischen Weissagung" (*Theol. Stud. u. Krit.* 1865, 1, 2, 1869; 1). Revised and issued as a separate treatise under the title, *Die messianische Weissagung, ihre Enstehung, ihr zeitgeschichtlicher Character und ihr Verhältniss zu der neutestamentlichen Erfüllung*, Gotha, 2nd ed. 1885. Translated by Rev. Lewis Muirhead, and published by Messrs. T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh 1891. Hofmann, *Weissagung und Erfüllung*, 1841; 44. *Schriftbeweis*, 2nd ed. 1859, vol. 2*a*. Hengstenberg, *Christologie des Alten Testamentes*, 2nd ed. vol. i. 249 ff. Translated by the Rev. Theodore Meyer, and published by Messrs. T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh 1878. Auberlen, "Die messianischen Weissagungen der mosaischen Zeit" (*Jahrbb. f. deutsche Theol.* iii. 4, p. 778 f.). Storr, *Opuscula theologica*, ii. Herder, *Briefe über das Studium der Theologie*, vol. ii. 225. Redepenning, *Commentarius in locos Veteris Testamenti Messianos* (Parts 1 and 2, Easter 1840, Christmas 1843). Maurice Vernes, *Histoire des idées messianiques*, Paris 1874. Rudolf Anger, *Vorlesungen über die Geschichte der messianischen Idee* (1873, ed. Krenkel). James Drummond, *The Jewish Messiah* (Post-Maccabean). C. v. Orelli, *Die alttestamentliche Weissagung von der Vollendung des Gottesreiches in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung dargestellt.* 1882. On the way in which the Church has dealt with the question of Messianic prophecy: Ernesti, *Narratio critica de interpretatione prophetiarum Mes-*

sianarum in ecclesia christiana (Opuscula, 495 f.); and Diestel, *Geschichte des Alten Testamentes.* On the blessing of Jacob: the treatises of Wagenseil and Deyling, in Ugolino, *Thesaurus antiq. sacr.* vol. xxvi. Jaq. Alting, Gröningen 1659. J. J. Stähelin, *Animadversiones quædam in Jacobi vaticinium.* Friedrich, Breslau 1811; Reinke, Münster 1849; Diestel, 1853; Land, *Disputatio de carmine Jacobi,* Gen. xlix., Specimen Academicum pro Gradu Doctoris Theol. Lugd.-Bat. 1858. Ewald, "Ueber die künstliche Weissagung in der Bibel" (*Jahrbb. f. biblische Wissenschaft,* xii. 2, 187 ff., 1861–65), "Geschichte des Volkes Israel," ii. 371. For the rest cf. Baur, *l.c.,* i. pp. 216, 227. On the blessing of Noah: Ewald, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel,* iii. 598; *Jahrbb. f. biblische Wissenschaft,* ix. 25. On the oracles of Balaam, cf. the literature in Baur, *l.c.* i. p. 329.

1. In general the thoughts of Israel previous to the eighth century are exclusively directed to the present life. It is not merely individuals who put existence after death quite into the background, as compared with this earthly life, with its joys and sorrows, its rights and duties. The people does so too. The consciousness of victory in the age of the conquest, and the sunny splendour of the kingdom under David and Solomon, gave no occasion for looking forward with longing desire to a better future. And during the period of the Judges, national perils made the people strain all their energies to reach the immediate goal. Nothing but the collapse of the nation could intensify the yearning for a future and complete salvation. And only a more spiritually developed conception of salvation could make this people fully conscious that the goal of God's ways must be something different, nobler, and more perfect. Still it was never quite without hopeful thoughts. What we call "Messianic views" necessarily belonged in a certain sense to the very essence of this religion. Since the God of heaven and earth is the covenant God of Israel, this people cannot but be confident that its God and its salvation

must be everywhere victorious and be revealed before the world as *the* God and *the* salvation. Consequently the Messianic idea, in its widest sense—that is, belief in the victory of the people of Jehovah—is, from the very first, part and parcel of Israel's religion. But the ways which lead to this goal, and the particular form in which it will present itself, are only gradually disclosed to the prophetic eye, and that too as a result of the historical surroundings of the people.

2. The oldest written testimony we have of such hopes of victory is probably the beautiful piece of popular poetry which has come down to us as Jacob's blessing. Not, indeed, as if it was actually a product of the patriarchal age, dictated by one of the nation's ancestors. It is impossible that a series of songs, consisting of a number of loosely connected oracles, of almost no importance for most of the tribes, should have held its ground for centuries, during the utter darkness of the sojourn in Egypt—itself a period without a history—during the heroic age of Moses and Joshua, and during all the confusion of the age of the Judges, till about the time of David. It is impossible that the separate tribes should have, for seven centuries, accurately preserved each its own particular prophecy, and these, prophecies without any important bearing on the present or the future of most of the tribes—that Asher, for instance, will inherit a fat land; Benjamin become noted for ferocity in war; and Issachar prove a feeble, dishonourable tribe. Must Reuben, Simeon, and Levi have faithfully preserved the record of their own shame, as is elsewhere done only in those satirical songs, with which one people is wont to express its contempt for another? Furthermore, it is impossible, even on the most high-strung theory of soothsaying, that such revelations about the future should have been made to the national ancestor. Had it been given to an ancestor of Israel's to discern, by miraculous illumination, the future of his posterity, what scenes would have passed before him!

The oppression in Egypt, the great deliverance, Zion with its house of God, the prophets and the priests, the Davidic king! That would have been a real glimpse into the future. And yet all that together would not be so unnatural and incomprehensible as these trivial geographico-statistical notices, which are a mere description of the map of conquered Canaan, and of the relations of the several tribes to each other, as these developed during the period of the Judges. To specify, several centuries beforehand, the boundaries of these little tribes, their historical peculiarities, their honour, and their shame, would certainly be the very strangest miracle of knowledge. And no one who understands the essence of true prophecy will have a moment's doubt as to the character of the sayings under consideration.

The piece is, as Land has shown to be probable, a song composed of several different national songs and proverbs. While much the larger part of it belongs to the latest period of the Judges, its closing stanzas date from about the commencement of the Davidic era. Words are put into the mouth of Israel's dying ancestor about the future of the several tribes. Their present sufferings and joys, as well as their hopes, are turned into prophecies. This is a dress of which the Old Testament is particularly fond, and one which we still find in Deuteronomy, Job, and the prophecies of Balaam, in Daniel, Ecclesiastes, Enoch, Ezra IV., etc. The real prophecy in this piece is not what is said about the tribes and their condition in Canaan. But the ideal hopes connected with Joseph and Judah are prophecies in the strict sense. For Joseph no hope is expressed, which would be of any special significance for the history of the chosen people, as such. In similes of matchless beauty he is promised warlike renown, glory, a large and fertile land, and princely rank among his brethren. On the other hand, the figure of Judah is brought into connection with the future of the whole people. On

him depends the hope that the kingdom of God will be triumphant.

This tribe is undoubtedly promised supremacy over its brethren. Its warlike prowess and glory are specially extolled. Then the metaphor of a ravening lion of resistless strength is beautifully exchanged for one of a peaceful character, representing Judah in the full enjoyment of everything good, with abundance of wine and milk, the very picture of undisturbed prosperity. Hence, as the leader of Israel all through the nation's period of struggle, Judah is undoubtedly to enjoy a season of undisturbed and glorious peace.

The only thing doubtful is whether the words of the difficult tenth verse are meant to add anything special to this idea. They run as follows, "The sceptre will not depart from Judah, nor the ruler's staff from between his feet" עַד כִּי יָבֹא שׁ(י)לֹה וְלוֹ יִקְהַת עַמִּים. The picture shows us Judah as a judge in Israel, with the ruler's staff in his hand,[1] as in the poetry of later times Judah is himself described as just such a ruler's staff in the hand of God.[2] This staff rests between the feet of Him who sits on the throne, as we often see in the relievos of Nineveh, which represent a king seated on his throne. It was also a Greek custom.[3] This state of royal, judicial dignity is not to cease till a still more perfect condition arises; in other words, is not to cease at all, but simply to develop into a glorious kingdom of perfect peace.[4]

The last words are obviously meant to express some kind of limitation to this hegemony of Judah. But the difficulty

[1] Num. xxi. 18; Judg. v. 14.

[2] Ps. lx. 9, cviii. 9.

[3] Pausanias ix. 406.

[4] It is well known that here the early Christian school of interpretation, *e.g.* Justin, ed. Otto i. 204, laid much stress upon the fact that with the coming of Shiloh—that is to say, the Messiah—the ruler's staff was to depart from Judah, *i.e.* the land was to lose its independence. Even Alting proves in vol. iv., that in Israel the distinction between the tribes and "the succession of teaching" ceased with the advent of Jesus. That all this is quite foreign to the meaning of the words requires no further proof.

of explaining the word Shiloh is so great that it might well occur to one to take the whole half-verse as a half-understood gloss, did not the whole construction and rhythm of the verse militate against such a view.

The most obvious interpretation is, without question, to refer the word שִׁילֹה, or, as it is perhaps better to read it, following the versions, שִׁלֹה, to the well-known Ephraimitish town which was, from the time of Joshua, the chief centre of political unity, and, till the disastrous war against the Philistines in Eli's days, the national sanctuary, and which, from that date, disappears from the history of Israel.[1] In that case one would naturally translate "until he comes to Shiloh," that is, until the rights of leadership, which he exercised during the wilderness journey, come to an end with the conquest of the country. But this reference seems to me absolutely impossible. To come to Shiloh cannot possibly mean, simply as it stands, to take part in the first parliament under Joshua. All the other tribes are described according to the circumstances in which they were when Canaan was already in their possession. Why, in the case of Judah alone, should attention be directed to him only down to this period? Besides, during the journey through the wilderness, and while the conquest was going on, Judah was no doubt one of the chief fighting tribes. But a sceptre it did not possess, least of all over its brethren. If a ruling tribe could be spoken of at all during that period, it was Levi, the tribe of Moses, and then Ephraim, the tribe of Joshua. Finally, with the parliament in Shiloh, Judah does not begin to get the "obedience of the peoples," no matter whether these "peoples" be taken to mean the tribes of Israel or foreign nations.

While giving this same translation, Ewald and Dillmann interpret somewhat differently, as follows: "Judah is the

[1] שִׁילוֹ, שִׁלֹה, שִׁלוֹ, Judg. xviii. 31; 1 Sam. i. 3, iv. 3 f.; Ps. lxxviii. 60; Jer. vii. 12, 14. For this place, the present Seilûn, cf. Robinson and Smith, *Travels*, iii. 305; Furrer, p. 226. The phrase, יבא שִׁלֹה, occurs in 1 Sam. iv. 12.

strong and successful leader of the people until he comes to Shiloh, and receives the obedience of the nations, *i.e.* until he has subdued the Canaanites, and can then think of peace in the fertile land." They remind us that Judah was the last to get settled, and that, as leader in the earliest times, he appears to have done the most to make Israel a nation. But this view is conclusively disproved by the one circumstance that, if we give up the reference to that first parliament, Judah did not come to Shiloh at all. Shiloh is a city of *Ephraim*, and it is simply impossible that "to come to Shiloh" should be the standing expression by which *another tribe* fixes the date of its own successful settlement.

Similar objections are conclusive also against Land's view. He translates "a ruler (sceptre?? according to the Septuagint) will not depart from Judah, in other words, David will not lose the hegemony over Judah until he (David) comes to Shiloh, *i.e.* until he brings Ephraim also under his sway, and with Ephraim all the tribes, after which the reign of peace will come." Land holds that it is a prophecy of blessing which David got while reigning at Hebron. But apart from the fact that here, where tribes are spoken of all through, the ruler's staff can scarcely indicate a king, even though the peoples be taken to mean, as is certainly possible linguistically,[1] the tribes of Israel,—it tells against this interpretation, that Shiloh, at that time, at any rate, was no longer the site of the sanctuary and therefore, no longer a symbol, as it were, of the national unity, and that Ishbosheth reigned at Mahanaim.

Consequently, those who hold by the place Shiloh, have to translate "so long as one comes to Shiloh," *i.e.* for all time. But the passages which prove that עַד has the meaning "while still," "during,"[2] do not, in my opinion, despite the

[1] Gen. xlviii. 4 (though there in a poetic passage); Deut. xxxii. 8 (doubtful), xxxiii. 3; Isa. iii. 13 (doubtful); most clearly in Lev. vii. 20; Hos. x. 14.

[2] Judg. iii. 26; Cant. i. 12 (עַד שֶׁ).

confident assertion of Baur, justify the translation of עַד־כִּי by "so long as." I also doubt, despite Jer. vii. 12, whether the phrase "so long as one comes to Shiloh," was a proverbial expression for "continually." Obviously, then, the "coming to Shiloh" is meant to be a limit of time, and the only possible subject to יָבֹא is either Judah or Shiloh.

Hence all reference to the city of Shiloh must be given up. By doing so, however, we launch out into the open sea of doubtful conjecture. It seems suitable to take Shiloh as a shortened form of the noun Shilon, which would thus be a proper name,[1] signifying "the man of peace," and then to translate "until the peaceful one comes." In that case it would be, to use Hengstenberg's phrase, "the first name of the Redeemer." But how should this word suddenly start up here like a mysterious phantom, to disappear again as suddenly? The poet should surely have said[2] "till the king come whose name is Shiloh." Others, changing the pronunciation of the word, give it the meaning of rest, resting-place, safety, and translate "until Judah comes to the resting-place, to peace." But how singularly liable to misapprehension would this idea have been when expressed by so very unusual a word, and by the accusative of direction, too!

I must frankly confess that I have not been able to make up my mind very clearly about these words.[3] It

[1] שִׁילוֹן (just as in the name of the city the וֹן is still heard in Seilûn). Hengstenberg is right in withdrawing, at Tuch's instance, the suggested connection with the formation קיטר. The name would be from שָׁלֵם = שָׁלֵם, and practically the same as the proper name שְׁלֹמֹה.

[2] שִׁלֵּה, שַׁלֵּה; cf. in Knobel (שַׁלְוִי, Ps. xxx. 7; cf. שַׁלְוָה, Ps. cxxii. 7; Prov. i. 32, xvii. 1; Jer. xxii. 21; Ezek. xvi. 49, etc. שַׁלְוְיָ, Job xvi. 12, xx. 20, xxi. 23; Ezek. xxiii. 42; Ps. lxxiii. 12, etc.). (Explanations such as "his child," after Deut. xxviii. 57, I naturally pass over in silence.)

[3] For the sake of completeness I mention Seineke's view (*Gesch. d. V. Isr.* Th. I. 1876, pp. 55, 56), who conjectures here an intentional mutilation of the word by the omission of the "m," and understands Shalem = Jerusalem. (In like manner, we should have Chirah = Chiram, Onan = Amnon, Shela = Shelomoh. —

seems to me most probable that שִׁלֹה is the original reading,[1] while שִׁילֹה represents, perhaps, a play of cabalistic ingenuity with the word Messiah,[2] and that the word is composed of אֲשֶׁר and לֹה, which stands for לוֹ, according to the style of this piece.[3] Similar combinations and שׁ for אֲשֶׁר are elsewhere very old,[4] and need not excite surprise in a piece marked by such linguistic peculiarities. A passage in Ezekiel already alludes in an unmistakable way to this meaning of these words;[5] and the versions themselves undoubtedly point to some such interpretation.[6] The verse would then run, "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor the ruler's staff from between his feet, until He comes to whom it belongs; and unto Him shall the obedience of the peoples be." In this case, we are shown as the goal of Judah's victorious career as premier tribe, the kingdom of David reducing the peoples to subjection,—for here, in contrast with "his brethren," "the sons of his father," the peoples are no doubt the heathen,—and bringing in a time of peace and abundant prosperity. If the piece was finished under the impression made by the rise of the youthful David, such a reference to him and such a forecast of his grand achievements need excite no surprise.

In this way, the hope of a golden age of peace and the thought of the kingdom of God being finally established,—in other words, the Messianic idea in its simplest form,—would be connected with the Davidic kingdom that was to come

Kayser's explanation might have a better claim for consideration: עַד כִּי יָבֹא, when booty is brought, שְׁלָלוֹ, it is his spoil, etc.; and most of all, Lagarde's conjecture שְׁאֵילָה (Onom. ii. 96), "he for whom Judah longs."

[1] Samar. Sept. Aquila, 25 Codd. of Kennicott, 13 of de Rossi, etc.

[2] יבא שילה is = 358 = משיח.

[3] Archaic form of הוּ—, *e.g.* twice in ver 11. [4] Judg. v. 7, עד־ש.

[5] Ezek. xxi. 32 (Eng. Bib. ver. 27), עד־אב אשר־לו המשפט.

[6] Sept. τὰ ἀποκείμενα αὐτῷ. Aquila, ᾧ ἀποκεῖται σκῆπτρον. Everything would certainly be very much simplified if, with Wellhausen and Stade, we might take ולו as a gloss intended to explain the unusual form שִׁלֹה, "until he comes whom the peoples obey," but the rhythm is against this explanation.

forth out of Judah and conquer the nations.[1] In any case, the hope of an age of victory and of happy peace is connected with Judah.

And to David, the man who was destined to realise to the people of God the idea of the kingdom, the assurance was clearly vouchsafed, not only by the prophetic words with which he was heralded, but also by the feeling of divine favour awakened within his own breast, that the kingdom founded by him would result in a sovereignty that would continually aim at a higher and nobler development, full of divine blessing and undreamt-of grandeur. True, one may justly doubt if Nathan's words to David in 2 Sam. vii. 4 ff., and the king's reply, have not been put into a more definite form, in reference to David's famous son, Solomon, the builder of the temple, than they historically had. But, in my opinion, all the rules of sound criticism warrant us in believing that Psalm xviii. and the last words of David in 2 Sam. xxiii. 1–8 are authentic.

It may be that the ideas of a later age are expressed when Nathan promises the king that his house, and Solomon in particular, the builder of the temple, will be specially favoured by God; that to him will belong, in a very special sense, the dignity of Israel as the Son of God; and that, consequently, to this royal house the sacred vocation of Israel will be specially delegated. And when the prophecy goes on to promise this house that, if it fall into sin, it will suffer chastisement, but not rejection, like Saul's family; that it will endure for ever, not, of course, in the metaphysical sense, as if any of its individual members would live "for ever," but in the sense in which this word is applied elsewhere to rulers and ruling houses,[2] viz. that there will be no sudden end, no break in the regular line of family descent; when, in a word, the complete establishment of the kingdom of God

[1] It seems to be already so interpreted in 1 Chron. v. 2.
[2] Cf. *e.g.* 1 Sam. i. 22, xiii. 13, 1 Kings i. 31.

on earth is directly connected with this Davidic house which God loves,—all this is, perhaps, a hope of later times. To these times also may be due the saying ascribed to David, when, with humble gratitude, he replies to this promise in the words: "Such favour is almost too much. Is this a way to deal with men,[1] that God should not only give them assurances for themselves but permit them to see the development of their race in later ages?" Now in his last words, with their genuinely antique diction,[2] David certainly speaks of God's sure and everlasting covenant with the house of David. And in Psalm xviii. he extols the God who giveth great deliverance to his king, and showeth lovingkindness to His anointed, to David and to his seed for evermore.[3] In fact, it was only on the basis of such assurance that the larger hopes could be afterwards built. Hence it was on the kings of David's house that the pious Israelite of later times centred all those hopes, of which the royal psalms are full,[4]—victory, dominion, life, and sonship with God.

4. Of quite a different character from this purely political and national hope is the outlook into the future found in the descriptions given by B and C of the early ages. The very beginning of the narrative regarding human sin and death opens with a grand glimpse of complete salvation. In pronouncing sentence on the tempter,[5] God says, "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise

[1] Such is my interpretation of וזאת תורת האדם, Is that man's way? is that how it is wont to be done by man or towards man? سَبِيلُ آلْإِنْسَانِ, תורת הפהנים, etc. Thenius differently, "And thus after the manner of men," etc. Thou hast spoken as one man to another. Ewald and Bertheau would read after Chronicles, ותראני דרות (1 Chron. xvii. 17).

[2] The utterance of David, the son of Jesse, the utterance of the man who was highly exalted, the anointed of the God of Jacob and the sweet psalmist of Israel (2 Sam. xxiii. 1).

[3] Ps. xviii. 51 (2 Sam. xxii. 51).

[4] Ps. ii., xx., xxi., xlv., cx.

[5] Gen. iii. 15.

his heel."[1] Since early days the seed of the woman has been understood to be the Messiah. But the term "seed," when it stands without any defining word, cannot well mean anything but posterity as such. It is true an individual may also be spoken of as "the seed of Abraham," etc., but in that case this narrower signification must be made quite plain. When the seed of the first woman, the mother of mankind, is spoken of, the only possible meaning is the human race in general, and any one of its members only as a member of the human family. Least of all is it permissible to understand by this "seed of the woman" a specially developed race of men in contrast to another race. No doubt one particular line of a man's descendants may be called his "seed,"—in other words, a particular branch of his descendants may be singled out from the rest, who are not made his heirs in the strict sense, and do not continue his family along the legitimate line. But in that case it must be expressly said, which line of his descendants is chosen, and why it is to be reckoned as "his seed," to the exclusion of the others. Where this is not done, all his children are his seed. Now in the case before us, the matter does not admit of doubt. It is impossible that one part of the human race should be "the seed of the serpent," and another "the seed of the woman." Why, for instance, should Cain, the woman's firstborn, not be called "the seed of the woman"? The woman is certainly not the representative of one race among mankind, the race that is to be saved, so that the children of salvation would be her children, as believers are, according to Paul, the children of Abraham. The woman is the sinful, natural mother of sinful, natural, redeemable humanity. Here, where the narrative is still dealing with the very beginning of

[1] The rare word שׁוּף might in itself be quite well used in two different meanings, "to bruise" and "to snap at" (parallel with שׁאף, cf. Job ix. 17; Dillmann). In this case the author would have intentionally played on the double meaning of the word. For our purpose it is a matter of no moment.

history, the human race is still included in the one common mother.

That there is a seed of the serpent hostile to this seed of the woman is indeed a plain inference from the whole purpose of the narrator. The woman and the serpent are hereditary foes. Their progeny are also to continue irreconcilably hostile. As a blood feud starts afresh with each new generation, so is this ancient struggle to be kept up for ever and ever. The narrative itself certainly does not require us to treat the seed of the serpent as a definite and clear conception. But if one must give a more definite explanation, the term is, at any rate, not to be understood as meaning the devil, and still less men who make themselves "children of the evil one." It is rather the self-generating power of temptation and sin in its individual manifestations.

Mankind must never make peace with this power of temptation and sin which has caused it to fall; in other words, with the sensual, selfish development of the animal life. Man must never feel content to remain an animal. The first triumph of temptation must result in a hereditary struggle, the moral struggle of humanity, which gives birth to all the higher life of mankind. This can never be a joyous, painless struggle. As the serpent pierces with its poison-fang the heel that crushes it, so man, in spite of painful wounds, must grapple with temptation. But the struggle will end in victory. Man will plant his foot on the venomous head of the serpent, temptation, and crush it to death.

Here, therefore, we have in very truth a Protevangelium. Whoever treats the Bible narrative with the justice which would never be denied to a Greek or an Egyptian myth, and takes the words not in their mere literal sense,[1] but, as the nature of a myth demands, in their deep moral and religious

[1] In that case it would simply be a question of the instinctive hatred which forces men and serpents into an irreconcilable struggle for mutual extermination.

significance, will acknowledge that our interpretation is not put into the words, but is taken out of them. Men have their task of salvation assigned them, with its pain and suffering, but also with the hope of victory in view. And it is most appropriate that, at the very threshold of human history, universal humanity should appear as victor in this battle, including, as it still does, in its own unity, every individual instrument of that victory, even the highest. How this victory is to be achieved, which race of mankind is to be chosen to lead the van in the battle, and what forms and phenomena of life will then come under review,—all this can be only gradually unfolded, as the whole plan of the narrative shows.

To entrust the sacred line of Shem with the task of saving humanity is the main purpose of the short section known as the blessing of Noah.[1] Ham, who has shamelessly dishonoured his father, is cursed in the person of his son Canaan.[2] Japheth and Shem are both blessed, though in different ways. While the wish is expressed that God should enlarge Japheth, that is, give him success and free development, it is said of Shem, the first-born, "Blessed be Jehovah, the God of Shem."[3] Hence Shem is to be the people of Jehovah, the people of the true God and the true religion. Consequently, as the first-born of this line, Abraham is, in the ordinary course of things, the bearer of the true religion.

For our purpose the meaning of this utterance is not really altered, whether the phrase in verse 27, "and let him dwell in the tents of Shem," be referred to Jehovah or to Japheth. For Jehovah's special relation to Shem is the main fact, and is not altered by either rendering. But, so far as this question

[1] Gen. ix. 25–27.

[2] Undoubtedly the narrative originally spoke not of Ham but of Canaan as Noah's son.

[3] When an account is being given of the great happiness or special glory of any person, the pious ejaculation of the ancient Hebrew is, "Blessed be the God of that person" (Gen. xxiv. 27).

itself is concerned, I am still of opinion that the reference to Jehovah is the more natural,[1] and that the author means to say that God will be one of Shem's household—will "dwell in the midst of him."[2] That Japheth (the Assyrian?) is meant to dwell with Shem as his guest, and destroy the Canaanite, is neither a natural interpretation of the words before us, nor in accordance with the circumstances of the time, to which B belongs. That Elohim stands here, and not Jehovah, is no argument against the view we are advocating. The former name of God had to be used in connection with Japheth; and if Jehovah had been repeated in place of it, then it would have seemed as if some contrast between Elohim and Jehovah were intended. Nor do I think it conclusive that the ו standing alone should not be taken as antithetical. There is no real antithesis between Japheth and Shem; both are blessed, although in different degrees. The main objection against the usual interpretation is, that one people cannot dwell in the tents of another, except as a conqueror,[3] a thought which, in this case cannot, of course, be entertained. Besides, it is quite natural that the recipient of the chief blessing should encroach even on his brother's blessing, just as the curse on Canaan is, in fact, repeated after the manner of a refrain.[4]

Within the family of Shem the work of salvation is now entrusted to Abraham, and to that part of his posterity which forms the holy line of Israel. To show these their work of salvation, and the hope of its perfect fulfilment, is the common object of the blessings communicated in B and C to the ancestors of Israel. It is certain they are assured by prophecy of a numerous and happy progeny, which will prove them to be the blessed of God on earth. It is certain they are promised the land of their sojournings, in its ideal extent,

[1] As *e.g.* v. Hofmann, i. 182. [2] Cf. *e.g.* Num. xxxv. 34; Ps. xlvi. 6.

[3] So *e.g.* 1 Chron. v. 10 (so Justin. ed. Otto, ii. 454).

[4] The translation, "And let him (Japheth) dwell in tents of renown" (after vi. 4, xi. 4), may be set aside, because in this context no one who did not intend to mislead the reader would use יֶשֶׁם except of Noah's son.

"from the river of Egypt even to the Euphrates." They are, therefore, represented as the blessed among mankind.

But these passages were also meant, according to the old view, to declare that in Abraham and his descendants all peoples would be blessed, since by him and his seed after him the true religion would be communicated to every nation. In that case we should see opening up before us the prospect of a universal salvation, and should be brought back from the line of Shem and Abraham, as the instruments of that salvation, to the mankind of the Protevangelium, with our minds enriched by new insight into the historical ways that lead to this goal of humanity. Nor would there be anything strange in this, considering how wide is the horizon of B.

But the words cannot bear this interpretation. If the Niphal of the verb had been used throughout, then, possibly, the passive meaning "be blessed" might be defended, although, even in the Niphal, by far the most common meaning is the reflexive or medial.[1] But in several of the passages under consideration the Hithpael alternates with the Niphal.[2] Beyond all doubt, therefore, the meaning is "to bless one another mutually." And of the passages in which the Hithpael occurs, one at least is certainly from B.[3] Consequently, the interchange of the two conjugations is a proof that here even the Niphal cannot have a purely passive meaning. Moreover, the expression "in thee" alternates with "in thy seed," or, "in thee and in thy seed." Most decisive of all, however, are the numerous similar phrases in the Old Testament, in which, without exception, a man is called a blessing, in the sense that, whenever one intends to pronounce a blessing, one quotes him as a visible proof of divine blessing: "God make thee as Abraham and as his seed."[4]

[1] Ewald, *Gram.* § 123*a*; cf. 133*a*.

[2] Niphal, Gen. xii. 3, xviii. 18, xxviii. 14; Hithpael, Gen. xxii. 18, xxvi. 4.

[3] Gen. xxvi. 4.

[4] Gen, xlviii. 20. "In thee let Israel bless, saying, God make thee as Ephraim and as Manasseh"; יתברכו בו parallel to יתהללו, Jer. iv. 2; simi-

In Abraham (and in his seed) all nations are to receive blessing, or bless themselves; in other words, wherever, among the nations of the world, a blessing is pronounced or received, there Abraham and his posterity are to be mentioned as the ideal of divine blessing. It is the promise of an unprecedented blessing which is to result from Abraham's blameless fidelity and devoted piety,[1] and be transmitted by him to all his descendants through endless generations, a blessing which certainly implies, according to the universal view of the ancient world, the indirect acknowledgment that the God of this family is also the true God of salvation.

And when it is said that God will bless those who bless the family of Abraham, and curse those who curse it,[2] the words imply that the people which saves mankind is also the people which condemns it, the stone on which one stumbles and by which one lifts oneself up. This thought, the full development of which is the doctrine that the Son of Man and His disciples are to judge the world, appears here in its first and, as yet, material form.

5. As for the ideas contained in Num. xxiv. 17–19 of a victorious future for Israel, the date of their origin cannot be fixed with any certainty, and they are not in themselves of any particular importance. The heathen seer, Balaam,[3] certainly a famous figure in Palestinian legend, appears as the hero of a little religious poem, the main thought of which is that, in the case of a people blessed of God, every evil design of its foes must eventuate in blessing. He has, against his will, to bless Israel and express the hopes which fill the

larly Ps. lxxii. 17 (to יאשרהו); cf. Mal. iii. 12. So a man becomes "a blessing," as, on the other hand, he becomes "a curse," when it is said, "God destroy thee like him," Jer. xxix. 22; Deut, xxviii. 37; Ps. xliv. 15, lxix. 12; 1 Kings ix. 7; cf. Zech. viii. 13; Jer. xlii. 18, xliv. 8, 12; Ezek. xxxiv. 26; cf. Ps. xxi. 7; Num. v. 21; Job xvii. 6, xxx. 9 (מלה, נגינה, משל, אלה). The nearest to our phrase is B. J. lxv. 16.

[1] Gen. xxii. 18, xxvi. 5.

[2] Gen. xii. 3.

[3] In Num. xxxi. 8, 16; Josh. xiii. 22 (A) his figure is sketched with bitter hostility.

breast of the poet. In religious import these go in no respect beyond what is contained in Jacob's blessing. Balaam points to the kingdom of Israel which will triumphantly destroy the surrounding nations. Probably this refers, in the first instance, to some historical king (David). But we may agree that hope is here soaring beyond the present. And the whole form of the purposely dark utterance regarding "the Star which, in the distant future, is to come out of Jacob," as well as the reference to the roar of great national storms, makes Balaam's words specially suitable as a foundation for further musings on the last age of man.

In the Mosaic age, therefore, as regards express and definite words, we meet merely with the first and simplest mode of anticipating the accomplishment of salvation. The prophecy begins with the external hope of national triumph and of Israel's supremacy in the land of his fathers, the hope of an age of peace after a glorious struggle, of a Davidic kingdom with its everlasting covenant of grace, its grand and splendid aims and its sonship to God. With this is connected, but in a more sporadic fashion, the hope of the moral triumph of mankind and its religious development, the main instruments of which are Abraham and his descendants. How old these Messianic hopes in their first national form are, we see from the fact that even Amos has to contend against the fleshly and immoral hopes with which the people thought of the "day of the Lord," that is to say, of history being triumphantly changed into victory for the kingdom of God.[1]

6. In addition to these glimpses into the future of which the people were conscious, prior to the age of the great prophets, a historical inquiry may also be permitted to allude in a few words to the signs by which at that time Israel's figure

[1] Amos v. 18 ff. If Joel's prophecy dated from the ninth century, then . 15, ii. 1 ff., would prove that even then "the day of God" was a constant element in the popular views.

and history gave indications, not noted by contemporaries, of a higher development, and thus enabled later ages to understand the goal. Such signs could not but exist among a people which had, while in an imperfect stage of development, to represent the purposes of God with man.

The covenant fellowship of Israel with God is not based upon the people's conduct, but upon God's mercy and thoughts of love. Hence it cannot be conceived of as weak or transient or destined to imperfect expression. God's plans cannot be frustrated by man's weakness. Consequently, this covenant requires an unchecked and triumphant unfolding of God's purposes of love with Israel. Being a covenant of the God of all the earth with His own people, it requires that all resistance on the part of the world should be rendered of no avail, and that God should prove Himself the Lord of the whole world. "All the earth must become full of His glory." And since His name and His honour are bound up with this people, it, too, must be made manifest as glorious, triumphant, world-subduing.

Even the way in which this world-conquest is to be brought about, is foreshadowed in the legend and history of Mosaism. Out of the holy family God develops a holy people. He gives His people a country as "the natural basis of its national spirit," the land of their fathers—Canaan. Thus God plants His salvation in the earthly soil of the life of a people which is developing into an independent state. This implies that salvation must be developed within a state whose king is God and whose statutes are heavenly, divine. And against the commonwealth of this state all the hostility of the world shall prove of no avail. For the power at work within it is the power of the God who rules the world, doing wonders. Thus the victories of Israel's youth are prophecies of the final victory of the kingdom of God over the whole earth. Thus the wonders of the Exodus and the deliverance from Egyptian oppression and bondage foretell

the wonderful deliverance of the growing kingdom of God out of every trouble and humiliation which the world can cause. To this kingdom the world must submit, or be ground to powder.

But the generation that Moses called from Egypt did not enter the land of promise. The salvation itself they could not, it is true, make of none effect by their unbelief. But they made it of none effect for themselves. And during the period of the Judges the people, by falling away from God, brought upon themselves sore distress. These judgments foretell that the accomplishment of salvation must, at the same time, be a judgment against unbelief and uncleanness in the sacred community. Only a remnant inherits salvation.

And when the flood sweeps away sinful humanity, when Sodom is destroyed by the fire of God, when Canaan, having defiled the land by following the shameless conduct of his ancestor, has to be destroyed from off its sacred soil with a terrible destruction, when the kingdom of God is established only by the condemnation and destruction of Egypt and Canaan, powers that contend with God,—all this is but a prophecy that the divine plans imply a judicial power on which life and death depend, and that whatsoever sets itself against God must go down before Him.

Moreover, sacred legend and history point to a mysterious and incomprehensible law of divine love and wisdom—the suffering of the best. Abel, who pleased God, dies by the murderous hand of Cain. Isaac, the son of promise, must lie on the altar ready to be offered up, while his father endures the most terrible of agonies in surrendering his only son. A fugitive and an exile, Moses must ripen into the man of salvation. In slavery, at the risk of his life, and in prison, Joseph must become the saviour of Israel. David, the great hero-king, must sojourn as a hunted outlaw and robber in the deserts and caves of Judah, till he becomes the deliverer of Israel. The heralds of salvation, the bearers

of God's mercy, have to pass through suffering and death before they win salvation for themselves and others. Salvation is not born save by the travail which the best endure. Indeed, the people itself in its bondage in Egypt is a type, as the community in Babylon was afterwards, of the suffering servant of God, and points to a mystery of divine wisdom.

Finally, the figures by which salvation is historically conditioned present themselves to the spirit by an inner necessity as conditions also of its fulfilment. When the prophets saw in vision the picture of this fulfilment, these figures naturally presented themselves as types of the instruments of this perfect salvation. In this sense Moses the prophet is the first type of the Mediator. By his side stands Aaron the priest, who connects the people with God, and consecrates it. This he certainly does in such a way that on the one hand this figure had but little significance for the prophets, and on the other there existed alongside of it a freer and more popular priesthood, which never quite disappeared from the horizon of the people.[1] But, from the time of David, both these figures pale in the imagination of the people before the picture of the Davidic king. His is the figure which appears the most indispensable condition of all true happiness for Israel. David is the third and by far the most important type of the Consummator.

Thus the prophets found in history itself the features, which they worked into their picture of the future. Their prophecy is their faith's interpretation of these features. Even the holy place with its local limitations, the closely-shut Holy of Holies, the shedding of animal blood,—in a word, the whole earthly array of sacred forms prophesied of spiritual realities of which it was but an imperfect expression.[2] "Moses," too, prophesied of Christ, as every transient form is a proof and prophecy of the Eternal.

[1] Gen. xiv. 18 ff.; Ps. cx. 4 (2 Sam. vi.; 1 Chron. xv. 27).

[2] Ex. xxv. 40 ; 1 Kings viii. 13, 27 (B. J. liii.; Heb. viii. 5, ix. 8, 13).

THE HOPE OF THE PROPHETIC PERIOD.

(a) Future Salvation as an Act of God.

CHAPTER XIX.

THE DIVINE ADVENT AND THE DAY OF THE LORD.

1. From the eighth century onwards the attention of the prophets had been more and more directed to the inevitable destruction of the outward glory of salvation as it first took shape. But it was impossible for them to think that the history of the kingdom of God in Israel could be ended by that destruction. Before their spiritual eye there rose from the ruins of their people's ancient glory a higher and more perfect form of the kingdom of God. When other peoples are in a state of decay, their spiritual representatives are wont to give expression to the sense of frailty and hopeless weakness; but here we see the very prophets who are laying Israel in the grave, and standing as mourners by the bier, declaring their unwavering conviction that this people's vocation is everlasting, and that in it salvation will come to full fruition.

The salvation of the future, like that of the past, can be brought about only by an act of God Himself. What Israel attempts without Him is travail without fruit.[1] However many the instruments of His salvation, God Himself is the really efficient cause of deliverance; and what He has been in the past, He will be in the future. Thus, from Amos down to the prophets of the Exile, the hope lives on that God in His unchangeable love to Israel will rescue, ransom, and redeem His people anew and for ever, grant them light and

[1] According to the figure of the late prophet, B. J. xxvi. 17 ff.

judgment, plead their cause,[1] and avert their suffering, so that Israel may, without money and without price, obtain the coming salvation.[2]

This hope is presented under the figure of a new, incomparable coming of God to His people in His full glory as king of all the earth. The beautiful figures of the old poetic imagery become instinct with life. We see God coming from His holy mountain in all the glory and majesty of the tempest. We see Him like a lion marching before His people.[3] But, above all, stress is laid on this, that He, the great King of all the earth, who possesses all nations,[4] will come to dwell on Zion, to set up His royal throne there over the whole earth, and manifest His glory,[5] so that all the heathen may know that He is King for ever and ever.[6] Many Psalms announce that God is King, and call upon all the world to do obeisance unto Him, and exult before the Lord, for He cometh—

> "For He cometh to judge the earth,
> To judge the world with righteousness,
> And the peoples with His truth."[7]

The end and aim of the kingdom of God is to reveal the God of Israel as the God of the whole earth. For such a salvation all the prophets hope. But their ideas of the degree of judgment and of the nature of the deliverance vary with the circumstances of their age and their personal character. Isaiah hopes that the punishment will leave a remnant; Micah foresees the destruction of the temple. Habakkuk

[1] Hos. vii. 1, xiii. 14; Isa. viii. 22 f., xxx. 18, 26, xxxi. 4 f., xxxiii. 5, 21; Micah vii. 8; Zech. x. 6; B. J. xxxiv. 8, xxxv. 4, 10, xliii. 3, 4, 15, xlv. 17, lx. 1 ff.

[2] The figure is from B. J. lv. 1 ff.

[3] *E.g.* Amos i. 2; Hos. xi. 10; B. J. xl. 3, 9.

[4] Ps. xlvii. 3, 8, lxxxii. 8.

[5] B. J. xl. 5, lix. 19 f., lii. 7, lviii. 8, lx. 1 f.; Micah iv. 7; Zech. xiv. 9.

[6] Ps. lix. 14.

[7] *E.g.* Ps. ix. 8 f., 20, xxii. 29, xlvii. 9, lvii. 12, lxviii. 30 ff., lxxv. 8 ff., lxxvi. 9 f., xciii. 1, xciv. 1, xcvi. 10, 13, xcix. 1, xcvii. 1, xcviii. 9, ciii. 19, cxlvi. 10, cxlviii., cxlix.

and the author of Zechariah xii. think only of a severe chastisement of the holy city, while Jeremiah sees that any attempt to defend the city will but end in complete destruction.

2. This coming of God is the change from the old to the new age, from the time of growth to that of completion. It is the greatest turning-point in the world's history, when heaven and earth are finally set in motion, when all relations are completely changed.[1] Hence, among all the days of time, this is the day which God has and creates for Himself, for His great work,[2] of which He speaks,[3] and in which He is glorified.[4] It is the day of the Lord,[5] or, as it is called with solemn emphasis, that day,[6] that time[7] (also absolutely the time or the day[8])—in short, as all these freely interchangeable expressions are meant to imply, that point of time in the future which is distinguished from all ordinary portions of time as the day of judgment, the day of God's decisive act.[9]

Originally the notion of this critical time was quite simple and uniform. In contrast with the times of long-suffering it was conceived of as a single day of divine revelation. But this judgment day developed into a series of divine acts, of times of judgment, which retained the single comprehensive name, "the day of the Lord."

The day of the Lord is a day of terrible wonders. God shows wonders and signs in the heavens, blood and fire and pillars of

[1] Isa. xxix. 17–24; Hagg. ii. 6, 22.

[2] Isa. ii. 12; Ezek. xxx. 3; Zech. xiv. 1; Zeph. iii. 8 (Mal. iii. 17).

[3] Ezek. xxxix. 8. [4] Ezek. xxxix. 13.

[5] יום יהוה, *e.g.* Amos ii. 4; Zeph. i. 10, 14; B. J. xiii. 6; Ezek. xiii. 5, xxx. 3; Joel i. 15, ii. 1, 11, iv. 14; Obad. 15.

[6] היום ההוא, an expression which of course is in itself quite general, and on later is applied quite as well to the judgment as to the deliverance; cf., *e.g.*, Isa. iii. 1 f., xvii. 7, xxx. 7 f., xxviii. 5, xxix. 17; Hos. ii. 23; Micah ii. 4, iv. 6, v. 9, iii. 4, vii. 11; Zech. ix. 16, xiv. 4, 6, 9; Ezek. xxxviii. 18; B. J. xxiv. 21, lii. 6, etc.

[7] העת ההיא, Jer. xxxi. 1, xxxiii. 15, l. 4; Joel iv. 1; Zeph. iii. 19 f. הימים ההם, Jer. xxxi. 29, xxxiii. 15 f., l. 4 (עת גוים, Ezek. xxx. 3.)

[8] היום, העת, Ezek. vii. 10, 12. That the day of the Lord must have been, even in the time of Amos, an idea well known to the people for a very long time, and cherished by them, has been pointed out above.

[9] Ezek. xxx. 9; Isa. v. 19, x. 25; B. J. xxvi. 21.

smoke.[1] He comes in His terrible glory and majesty, and arises to affright the earth.[2] Darkness and gloom herald His approach; the sun itself is darkened; the stars withhold their light; the moon is changed into blood. Beneath the blows of an angry God the earth rocks like a hammock, staggers like a drunken man; the destroying floods burst in.[3] In short, all the figures depicting violent interruptions of the ordinary course of nature, from the flood down to the earthquake in the time of Uzziah, are gathered together into one sublime and awful picture, the details of which the prophets work out with a full consciousness of poetic freedom.[4]

When this day will come, is a secret even to prophecy; and in reply to all the murmurs of the people the prophets declare that the delay in its coming need mislead no one as to the certainty of divine judgment.[5] Sometimes it is said "the time is distant";[6] sometimes, and of course especially during the Exile and after it, "the day of the Lord is near."[7] But the coming of this day is invariably connected with definite historical events or circumstances in the then present. Natural phenomena of a terrible character—as in Joel, drought and a plague of locusts,[8]—or historical events like the threatened approach of great conquerors, such as the Scythians, Assyrians, Chaldeans, and Medes, are the signs of the time with which the prophets associate the coming of the great day. The only one who knows of a human forerunner, who is to herald this day and prepare for it, is Malachi,[9] who takes for granted that the appearance of Elijah is a condition of the judgment day.

3. The day of God as such was of course for Israel

[1] Amos viii. 8 ff.; Joel iii. 3.
[2] Isa. ii. 19 f.
[3] Amos viii. 8 f., ix. 5; Zech. xiv. 4; B. J. xiii. 10, 13, xxiv. 18–20, 23, xxxiv. 1–5; Joel ii. 2, 10, iii. 4, iv. 15.
[4] Amos viii. 8 ff., ix. 5; Micah i. 3 f.; Hab. iii. 3 ff.; Nahum i. 4 ff.; Ezek. xxxviii. 19 ff.; Joel ii. 10.
[5] Isa. v. 19.
[6] Isa. x. 3; Micah vii. 11 ff.; Hab. ii. 3.
[7] Zeph. i. 14; Ezek. xii. 28, xxx. 3, xxxvi. 7 ff.; B. J. xiii. 6, 9, l. 8; Joel i. 15, ii. 2, 11, iv. 14.
[8] Joel i. 4 ff., 17 ff.
[9] Mal. iii. 23 ff.

originally a day of salvation and joy. And the frivolous populace, led astray by false prophets, liked to speak of it as something which should be wistfully looked for. But, in contrast to such immoral levity, the true men of God emphasise, in the most express terms, the seriousness of this day. Every decision by which the establishment of God's kingdom is to be brought about must also be a sifting for those who think that, in their outward form, they actually represent this kingdom of God. Hence, the day of the Lord is a day of judgment even for the people, a day of visitation, of storm, of clouds and mist, when God brings ruin and judgment upon the whole land.[1] And even where the punishment of the enemies of Israel is the main subject, it can also be said, "Howl ye! for the day of the Lord is at hand, and as destruction from the Almighty it cometh;—all hearts quake—it is a cruel day, a day of rage and wrath and fury."[2]

Hence the men of God advise the wanton masses of the people not to wish for the day of the Lord, which will be a terrible day, a day of God's vengeance.[3] They shall say on that day, "Ye mountains, Fall on us; ye hills, Cover us."[4] Whatever in Israel is but dirt and dross will be swept away without mercy. God refines His people by the spirit of judgment and of fire.[5] All that is high and trusts in its own strength will be broken down.[6] It is a day of death, of dispersion and destruction, especially for Israel.[7] False leaders

[1] Amos ii. 4; Micah i. 5, ii. 3; Isa. x. 3, 6, 23, xxii. 2, 5, xxviii. 21 f.; B. J. xiii. 11; Zeph. i. 15 ff.; Joel ii. 2; Ezek. xxxiv. 10; Mal. iii. 1 ff.

[2] Hab. iii. 16; Joel i. 15, ii. 11; B. J. xiii. 6, 9, 14, xxiv. 16 ff.

[3] Amos v. 18–20; Zeph. i. 18, ii. 2 f.; Jer. xxx. 7; Mal. iii. 2, 19, 23; cf. Hos. viii. 13, ix. 7; Isa. iii. 13, xxix. 1 ff. 6; Lam. ii. 21 ff.; B. J. li. 12 ff., lviii. 2. This is not yet the rest, Micah ii. 10. Cf. the terrible threatenings in Lev. xxvi., Deut. xxviii.

[4] Hos. x. 8; Amos ii. 13 ff., iii. 11 ff., iv. 3, v. 2, 27, vi. 6 ff., 11, vii. 16 ff., viii. 10 ff., ix. 1 ff.

[5] Isa. i. 25 ff., 31, iii. 1 f., iv. 5; B. J. xlviii. 10.

[6] Isa. ii. 12 ff.

[7] *E.g.* Amos ii. 4–6; Hos. iv. 16 ff., v. 8 ff., viii. 1 ff., 13, ix. 2 ff.; Micah i. 6 ff., iii. 12, iv. 10; Zeph. i. 18, iii. 1 ff.; Zech. x. 2; Jer. ix. 11 f., x. 7, 22, xi. 11 ff., xiii. 19, 24, xiv. 18; Ezek. xxii. 15; Isa. x. 5, 23; xxxii. 9 ff.; Joel i. 15; Zech. xiv. 2 (cf. Micah v. 2), is peculiar, for there the holy city is half-

and rich debauchees come to nothing, the rams are separated from the flock.[1] All the bands of order snap, everything is reduced to chaos; and no one will undertake to rule.[2] Only the elect are saved; only a remnant remains and is converted; only the tenth part of the people—a holy stock of the once green tree—remains as a seed for the better future.[3]

As is natural, this dark side of the final age does not get the same attention from all the prophets. In fact, the same prophet may understand and emphasise it differently at different periods of his life.[4] It is the keynote of those who, immediately before the Exile, see the divine punishment drawing terribly near to the people, and have to declare that Israel by breaking the covenant has divested itself of covenant rights, and incurred the wrath of God.[5] In happier times and especially at the return from the Exile, it becomes much less prominent. Nevertheless even in times like these, as a comparison of the passages already quoted will show, this aspect is by no means forgotten by the prophets. In fact the words of the exilic prophet, from whom the later descriptions of hell are borrowed, are originally applied to the apostate members of the people who are to lie, as an everlasting example of what all God-fearing men should abhor, before the gates of the new Jerusalem, putrefying and burning everlastingly.[6]

destroyed before deliverance comes. Ezekiel, too, prophesies with special emphasis the utter destruction of all who still remained in Judah, xxxiii. 26 ff.

[1] *E.g.* Hos. v. 1; Amos vi. 4 ff., ix. 10; Isa. i. 28 ff., iii. 16 ff., v. 8 ff., 23, xxix. 20, xxxiii. 14, xxviii. 16 ff.; Jer. xxiii. 1 ff., xxx. 23; Zech. x. 3, 5, xi. 16 f., xiii. 7; Ezek. xxxiv. 1 ff., 15 ff., etc.

[2] Isa. iii. 5 ff.

[3] Isa. vi. 13 ("And (the people) returns; and it is destroyed like the terebinths and oaks of which, when they are felled, a stock remains"; in other words, it is not destroyed without a prospect of fresh growth. Hence the tenth part is not to be thought of as burned a second time; Zech. xiii. 9 ff. it is true, and Ezek. v. 1 ff. even more strongly, think of a double purification); cf. Isa. vii. 3, x. 20 ff., xi. 10 f., xxviii. 5; Jer. iv. 27, v. 18, vi. 9; Ezek. v. 3 ff., 10, ix. 4 ff.; Amos iii. 12, v. 3; Zech. xiii. 8 f., B. J. lxv. 12, lxvi. 6, 14–16, 25, xliv. 15; Joel iv. 5 (*κλητοί*).

[4] For Jeremiah cf. Guthe, *l.c.*, p. 38 f.

[5] Jer. ii. 23, v. 10, xi. 11, 16.

[6] B. J. lxvi. 24.

And Jeremiah actually makes it the sign of a false prophet to announce nothing but peace, for that can only produce a false security.[1] The true prophetic message must be moral. It must not conjure up a phantom in order to foster the national vanity and the sense of outward security. The picture of the last day must be a sermon urging to repentance, even to the dividing asunder of the joints and marrow. Though the prophets know that the end of all these judgments will be the salvation of Zion, they must also know that the day of God will be a day of violent shaking, and that against everything having fellowship with ungodliness in Israel the judgment of God draweth nigh.[2] The salvation of the new era comes only after sore travail.[3] The burden of all true prophecy is: "To-day, if ye will hear His voice, harden not your hearts."[4] The judgment is meant to impart a knowledge of God, to refine and sift, so that there will be a hungering after the word of God.[5]

4. But, for the true Israel which survives the sore time of judgment, joy and hope are the chief characteristics of the last day. God cannot be so angry with His people as to reject them utterly; He is Israel's blood-avenger, and pleads his cause.[6] The times of anger against Israel, the pains of travail, come to an end: God heals the hurt of His people.[7] The day of the Lord becomes a day of vengeance against Israel's enemies and oppressors, a day of retribution for all nations.[8] The despots who oppressed Israel more than they ought, so

[1] Jer. xxiii. 22, xxviii. 8; Ezek. xiii. 22. Thus Micah ii. 12 f. represents the false prophets as uttering true prophecies, but dwelling upon only the favourable half of them. The "remnant," Jer. iv. 27, v. 10, 18, viii. 3, xxx. 11, xlvi. 28.

[2] B. J. xxiv. 16 ff.; Joel ii. 15 ff.; Hagg. ii. 6, 21 f.

[3] Micah iv. 14, v. 2; B. J. xxvi. 20. (Hence probably the חבלי־המשיח).

[4] Ps. xcv. 7, 11.

[5] Amos viii. 11, ix. 9; Ezek. xii. 15 f., 20, xxii. 14 f., 18 ff., xxxiii. 29, xxxiv. 27, 30, xxxvi. 11, xxxvii. 6, 13, xxxix. 22, 28.

[6] Amos ix. 8 ff.; Jer. l. 34, li. 36; Ezek. xxxiv. 11 ff.

[7] Isa. xxx. 26; B. J. xxvi. 20, li. 12 ff., liv. 7 f.

[8] Isa. xxx. 25; Hab. iii. 13 ff.; Deut. xxx. 7; Obad. 15; Jer. xxv. 29, xxx. 16 ff.; Ezek. xxxii. 1 ff.; B. J. xxxiv. 8, xlvii. 3, lxi. 2, lxiii. 4 (cf. Jer. xlvi. 10, l. 15, 28, li. 6, 11, 14, 36, 56, etc.).

that he received double for all his sins,[1] are broken like worn-out tools and thrown aside.[2] The bondage of the people is at an end, and words of consolation are addressed to them.[3] Hence Israel's yearning cry: "Oh that Thou wouldest rend the heavens, that thou wouldest come down, that the mountains might flow down at Thy presence!"[4] The earthly power which rises against Israel, the great mountain in Israel's way, is shattered by the blows of God on the day of the great battle, when the towers fall, when God in the fierceness of His anger makes bare His arm against the heathen.[5] Yea, even the supramundane powers are overthrown, which warred along with the nations of earth against the kingdom of God.[6]

It is, of course, perfectly impossible to give, from a scientific point of view, a coherent picture of final judgment, and of divine deliverance, that will combine every prophetic feature. Whoever undertook such a task, would have to deal with each individual prophet, in chronological order, and state his particular view of this critical time, and show how much he owes to his predecessors and to the circumstances of his age. In fact, the picture changes, according as Judah and Jerusalem are still in existence, or are already destroyed; according as Assyria, Babylon, or Persia, oppresses the people; according to the relation of the people to God at the particular moment; or according as the prophet in question belongs to the northern kingdom, or to the southern. It nowhere contains mere soothsaying, but is a poetic picture sketched with the freedom characteristic of poetry. And, even as regards

[1] In this sense B. J. xl. 2 is to be understood, for in the context it cannot mean "she must receive double for her sufferings," and it cannot, from a religious standpoint, be meant that God has punished His people wrongly; it certainly does not receive its proper meaning till it is referred to Jer. xvi. 18. What is there threatened, is now fulfilled.

[2] Isa. x. 5, 15, xxx. 27 ff., xxxi. 8, xxxiii. 1; Jer. xxx. 16, 20; B. J. xxvii. 1, xlvii. 6 ff., xlix. 26; Zech. i. 15, ii. 4, 13.

[3] Isa. ix. 3, x. 27, xxix. 22 f.; Zech. x. 11; Nahum i. 13; Jer. xxx. 8; Ezek. xxxiv. 27; B. J. xl. 1 ff.

[4] B. J. lxiv. 1 ff. [5] Isa. ii. 10, 11, 17, 19, 21, xxx. 25 ff.; Zech. iv. 7.

[6] B. J. xxiv. 21.

what is religiously and morally important and true, an Ezekiel's hopes are not to be compared with those of Jeremiah, or a Zechariah's with those of Isaiah. But certainly everything having an important bearing on religion itself appears to be essentially the same from Amos to Malachi.

The terrors of nature are depicted again and again by almost all the prophets, and in a style marked by the utmost poetic freedom.[1] The idea is frequent that the turning-point of Israel's destiny will occur at the very moment when the pride of his enemies, and their assurance of victory, are at their very highest. When the enemy has his arm uplifted to deal the final blow;[2] indeed, according to the second Zechariah, when he is already in possession of the holy place, so that the people flee through the miraculously created gorge which cleft in two the Mount of Olives;[3] or when the hosts of the nations are on the march for the last war against the holy people,[4]—according to Ezekiel, against the people already restored by the Messiah,[5]—then it is that God strikes. Sometimes it is God alone who, with miraculous might, shatters the foe, and avenges Himself with keen satisfaction on those who hate Him, while the people look on expectantly.[6] Sometimes it is the people who, in God's Spirit and might, with the Messiah at their head, break off the yoke.[7] Sometimes it is the inhabitants of the land, compelled to fight in the ranks of the foe against their own countrymen, who begin the war of extermination.[8] But the enemy is invariably represented as stunned and dismayed by some act of God.[9] They are as one who has, in a dream, been eating and drinking, and who on awaking finds himself hungry and thirsty.[10]

[1] Cf. *e.g.* also Ezek. xxxi. 15 ff., xxxii. 7 ff., xxxviii. 19 ff.
[2] Isa. x. 28–33; cf. xvii. 13 f., xviii. 4 ff.; Zech. xii. 1 ff.; B. J. xiv. 25.
[3] Zech. xiv. 2; cf. 4 f. [4] *E.g.* Joel iv. 11 f.
[5] Ezek. xxxviii. 8 ff., xxxix. 8 (Gog and Magog).
[6] Isa. xxx. 29, xxxi. 8; Zech. xiv. 3 (Hos. i. 7).
[7] Micah iv. 13; Zech. ix. 13, x. 5, 7; Joel iii. 1, iv. 10 (Isa. ix. 3, 5).
[8] Zech. xii. 4–7. [9] *E.g.* Zech. xii. 4 ff. [10] Isa. xxix. 8 ff.

Furthermore, since the commencement of Israel's dispersion, it is a fixed idea that the people, in so far as it has fallen a prey to the heathen world, is to return. God brings the captive ones of His people home.[1] He delivers anew,[2] redeems once more[3] the remnant of His people; releases, because of the blood of the covenant, "the prisoners of hope," those, that is, who are not in bondage for ever.[4] It is a redemption without money,[5] by the great and mighty deeds of God, by His uplifted arm, as of yore He smote Egypt or Midian.[6] The son Lo-Ammi changes into "the children of the living God.[7]" The God who brought out of Egypt, becomes the God who brings out of Chaldea.[8] Or, it is also said in the exilic prophet: As ransom for His captive people, God gives the most distant and most powerful lands, Egypt and Ethiopia, to the hero whom He summons to the rescue.[9]

Thus Israel obtains salvation and splendour, and comes back from its grave, inspired with new life by the living Spirit of God.[10] Then follows a wonderful home-coming, more glorious still than that in the time of Moses. Everything is

[1] שׁוּב שְׁבוּת. It seems to me from the interchange with הֲשִׁיב, Jer. xxxiii. 7, 11; Ezek. xvi. 53, xxxix. 25; Lam. ii. 14, to be beyond all doubt that even in Jer. xxix. 14, xxx. 3, 18, xxxi. 23, xxxiii. 26; Hos. vi. 11; Joel. iv. 2; Amos ix. 14; Zeph. ii. 7, iii. 20; Deut. xxx. 3; Ps. xiv. 7, liii. 8, lxxxv. 2, where it is used of Israel, and in Jer. xlviii. 47, xlix. 6, 11, 39, where it is used of foreign nations, the root-meaning is "to let captivity return" (=שְׁבִי) *i.e.* to let the captives return. With this it was certainly easy to connect the more general meaning, to change "the condition of captivity," *i.e.* of misery, as in Job xlii. 10. That שׁוּב אֶת־שִׁבְתּ is interchangeable with שׁוּב שְׁבוּת in Ps. cxxvi. 1, cf. 4, merely proves, in connection with the late date of the Psalm, that the phrase was used very freely and arbitrarily, and was altered to suit the assonance.

[2] נָאַל, פָּדָה, B. J. xxxv. 10, li. 11; Ps. cxi. 9, cxxx. 8; cf. B. J. lxii. 12; Ps. cvii. 2.

[3] קָנָה, Isa. xi. 11 ff. [4] Zech. ix. 11 f., x. 10 ff.

[5] B. J. xlv. 13, lii. 3.

[6] Isa. ix. 3 f., x. 24, 26, xi. 15 f.; B. J. xiii. 19, xliii. 17, lii. 10, liv. 9, lxiii. 11 ff., 19, lxii. 8, xxvii. 12 ff.

[7] Hos. ii. 1; cf. 23. [8] Jer. xvi. 15 ff., xxiii. 7 ff. [9] B. J. xliii. 3 f.

[10] Ezek. xxxvii. 12–14; B. J. xlvi. 13.

made level and smooth for the people; the wilderness becomes like Eden.[1] According to a much rarer view, the people is to go into the wilderness, as formerly in the exodus from Egypt, that they may there receive instruction and be purified.[2] Everything is to be still grander and nobler than in the wonderful patriarchal days. People will speak no more of the deliverance out of Egypt; but the song which once resounded by the Red Sea is to be sung, in new and higher strains, in praise of the new thing which God has done,[3] —a pleasant fruit of the lips which God creates.[4] And this new salvation is never again to give place to new fear or to new wrath on the part of God. A new judgment of God is no more likely to recur than a new flood.[5] Thus suffering is transformed. Out of Israel's deepest distress and affliction, the terrors of the day of the Lord bring forth an enduring, yea an everlasting, salvation.

CHAPTER XX.

THE LAST AGE AND ITS BLESSINGS.

When God shows Himself graciously inclined toward His people, then is the time when He may be found, then is the acceptable time![6] But when the day of the Lord and its judgments have brought about a condition of things which is no longer imperfect, and admits of no further change, then is come "the end of the days," the last age.[7] The expression is

[1] B. J. xxxv., xliii. 2, xlviii. 21, xlix. 10 ff., lii. 11 ff. (cf. Ex. xv.), li. 3, 11, lv. 12, lvii. 14, lxii. 10–12; cf. Jer. xxxi. 2, 8, 21 (xxiv. 5 ff., xxix. 10); Zech. x. 10–12.

[2] Ezek. xx. 35; cf. Hos. ii. 14, 16, 17.

[3] Isa. xii.; B. J. xxvi. 1 ff., xlii. 10, xliii. 17; Jer. xxiii. 7 f., xvi. 14 f., xxxi. 22 f.

[4] B. J. lvii. 19. [5] B. J. liv. 9. [6] B. J. xlix. 8, lv. 6, lxi. 2.

[7] אחרית הימים (הבאים, B. J. xxvii. 6). The phrase is already found in Gen. xlix. 1, Num. xxiv. 14, Hos. iii. 5, Micah iv. 1, Isa. ii. 2, Ezek. xxxviii. 8, etc.

used by the prophets in quite a general sense, as describing the latest conceivable age, that which has no new change to fear. It denotes both the period of suffering and the judgments, in so far as these belong to the latest period of development.[1] Taken strictly, however, it denotes the time of blessedness, the result of those judgments. We must not think, however, that the finer distinctions regarding this last age were drawn by all the prophets. Thus it is sometimes taken for granted that the Messiah Himself ushers in this era;[2] sometimes, that He makes His appearance during the course of it.[3] It is not contrasted with the world to come, as the closing epoch of the present world,[4] but is itself the permanent, transfigured development of earthly conditions.

The last age—a glorified replica of the creation-epoch, so that the beginning and the end complete the circle—is the golden age where there is no more imperfection and no more sorrow, where outward lot and worth are no longer at variance, where the God of the world is no longer known and worshipped by a mere handful, where, therefore, the followers of this God reap the full advantage of belonging to Him who is omnipotent.

This conception of the closing era determines the way in which it is depicted. We nowhere find prophecies of individual future events. Everything is purely poetical and ideal. In contrast to the wants and woes of the actual world there is painted, on a ground of gold, the bright picture of an ideal world. All the glorious days of splendour which the past had known, and which posterity saw with the halo that memory cast around them—all that imagination had ever desired for the people of God as a recompense for the

[1] Deut. iv. 30, xxxii. 29; Jer. xxx. 24.

[2] Isa. ix. 1 ff., xi. 1 ff.; Micah v. 1.

[3] *E.g.* Zech. xii. 8 f.; Jer. xxxiii. 15 f.

[4] As ἔσχατον τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων, which still belongs to the αἰὼν οὗτος, and does not form part of the αἰὼν μέλλων, according to the doctrine of the Scribes, on which Hebrews i. 1 is founded.

misery of the present,—all this was formed into one bright picture, ever-changing and full of charm. Things which, in the world of experience, are mutually exclusive, are put by the different prophets side by side. Every attention is given to depicting the essentials of an age of bliss, but none at all to details. Every feature of importance in the picture is already to be found in Amos, Hosea, and Isaiah, although here, as is natural, the exilic prophets have used the richest and grandest colours.

1. The Israel of the last days is a holy remnant, a purified people, a nation of God-fearing men.[1] Its unworthy members have been cut off; the goats have been separated from the sheep.[2] There is no more unfaithfulness, no worship of idols.[3] It thus enjoys complete salvation. God will dwell in Zion in real fellowship with His people, such as never before existed.[4] He is Zion's ornament and glory, its judgment and strength.[5] To the people, He is both sun and moon;[6] to the sanctuary, a pillar of fire and cloud—a pavilion in sunshine and storm.[7] To the holy people He is betrothed by an everlasting betrothal.[8] They become, in the true sense, a people of God.[9]

From the time of Josiah this new relation to God is represented as a new and higher covenant of God with Israel—that is, as a new religion. The old covenant was written on stone. It stood before man as an external command; and accordingly it was not observed.[10] But God will make a new covenant with

[1] Isa. i. 26, vi. 13, x. 20 ff.; Mal. iii. 16, 17, 20.

[2] Ezek. xxxiv. 17, 20 f. (Zeph. i. 2 ff., iii. 11 f.; Zech. xiii. 9).

[3] Isa. xxx. 22, xxxi. 7; Hos. ii. 18 ff.; Zech. xiii. 2; Ezek. vi. 8 f., xi. 18 f.

[4] Micah iv. 7; Hos. xiv. 5; Isa. iv. 2 f.; Deut. xxviii. 9; Jer. xxxi. 3; cf. viii. 19; B. J. xxv. 6 ff.; Joel iv. 21. Connected in a more external way with the temple in Ezek. xliii. 2, 4, xliv. 4; in Zech. ii. 10–13, viii. 3; and in Mal. iii. 1 ff.

[5] Isa. xxviii. 5.

[6] B. J. lx. 19; cf. xxiv. 23.

[7] Isa. iv. 5.

[8] Hos. ii. 19 ff.

[9] Jer. xxx. 22, xxxi. 1, xxxii. 38; Ezek. xi. 20, xiv. 11, xxxiv. 24, xxxvi. 28, xxxvii. 23, 27; Zech. viii. 7, xiii 9.

[10] Jer. xxxi. 32.

Israel, which is written on the heart—that is, has the motive power of a new life.[1] Instead of the heart of stone, He gives them a new heart of flesh, a new spirit by which to love Him with their whole heart.[2] This new covenant is an everlasting covenant, like the great ordinances of nature,[3] an unalterable pardon, a covenant of peace, which makes its members sure of being heard by God before they ask.[4] All will be taught of God.[5] The divine Spirit, which now influences prophets only, will then be poured out on all alike, on young and old, on bond and free.[6] The blind will see, the deaf hear, and the lame become fleet-footed.[7] God exults in His people.[8] Thus Jeremiah, for instance, thinks more of direct moral and religious perfection; Ezekiel, more of Israel's perfect sanctity. It is always his own conception of Israel's ideal life that determines the individual prophet's ideal of the future.

From this there results a righteousness which covers the whole earth, as the waters cover the sea.[9] No one acts wickedly any more, for the earth is full of the knowledge of God.[10] Into the new city of God there comes a righteous people which keeps its troth.[11] The land is full of humble, believing souls who loathe their sins,[12] and lead virtuous and honourable lives.[13] The thirsty obtain water, milk, and wine; yea, living water from the spring which flows from Zion, without money and without price.[14] The heavens drop down, the earth brings forth, salvation and

[1] Jer. xxxi. 31 ff.; cf. xxxii. 40, li. 19; Ezek. xi. 16 ff., xvi. 60. (In B. J. xlii. 6, xlix. 8, the servant of Jehovah is "the covenant of the people").

[2] Ezek. xi. 19 f. (Deut. xxx. 6); cf. Ezek. xxxvi. 25 ff., 33, xxxvii. 23, xxxix. 29.

[3] Jer. xxxiii. 20 ff.; B. J. lix. 21, lxi. 8.

[4] B. J. liv. 10, 13, lxv. 24.

[5] Jer. xxxi. 31 (B. J. iv. 13).

[6] Isa. xxxii. 15; B. J. xliv. 3, lix. 21; Joel iii. 11 ff. (Zech. vi. 8).

[7] B. J. xxxv. 5 ff.

[8] Zeph. iii. 17.

[9] Jer. xxxii. 39 f.; Ezek. xi. 17–21.

[10] Isa. xi. 9.

[11] B. J. xxvi. 2, 7; cf. lx. 21; Isa. xxxii. 1–5, 16–18, xxxiii. 5 f.; Jer. xxiv. 5 ff.

[12] Zeph. iii. 13, 11; Isa. xxix. 19; Ezek. xxxvi. 31.

[13] *E.g.* Isa. i. 26 ff., xxix. 20 f.; Zech. xii. 10, Ezek. xi. 17–21.

[14] B. J. lv. 1 ff.; cf. Joel iv. 18.

righteousness.[1] On the other hand, everything is conceived of as thoroughly human and earthly. The community inhabits the earthly Zion. In fact, even sin can still be committed in the New Jerusalem, though not sin that entails judgment.[2] For the people that dwells in Zion is free from guilt; its sin is forgiven.[3] Its treasure is the fear of God.[4] It receives a new and holy name, while the name of the old sinful people becomes a term of execration.[5]

In this new fellowship with God even the holy things of His ancient people undergo a change. True, it is only the later prophets who take an interest in sacred things of an external kind, and even in their case this interest varies very much according to their individual temperaments. In Ezekiel's representation the temple of Israel develops into an ideal sanctuary of undreamt-of splendour,[6] while it is still said in Jeremiah that, in the full presence of God, the pledges of the old historical salvation may vanish.[7] The sacrifices of Israel become acceptable to God, when offered in the right spirit.[8] Jerusalem will be a holy city, no longer desecrated by anything unholy.[9] Her walls are salvation, and her gates praise.[10] She is given a new name; she is called the faithful city.[11] She is to be inhabited as villages are, because

[1] B. J. xlv. 8. [2] B. J. lxv. 20.

[3] Isa. xxxiii. 24; Jer. xxxi. 34, xxxiii. 8, l. 20; Ezek. xvi. 63; Zech. iii. 9, v. i. 6 ff.

[4] In Isa. xxxiii. 5, xxxii., xxxiii. 17 ff., Israel's righteousness is described. Justice, righteousness, and compassion are already mentioned in Hos. ii. 21 as the chief characteristics of the Messianic community.

[5] B. J. lxv. 15; cf. Isa. i. 26.

[6] Ezek. xl. ff. (B. J. lx. 13), is certainly meant as an actual law for the golden age (cf. *e.g.* xliii. 18 ff.).

[7] Jer. iii. 16 (no ark of the covenant). Perhaps Jeremiah, who generally contends so very strongly against the exaggerated importance assigned to sacred form, is not thinking at all definitely, in spite of xxx. 18, of a *special temple in the New Jerusalem, but of the holy city as a whole, being the place of sacrifice* (iii. 16 f., xxxi. 38).

[8] Jer. xxxi. 14, 18; Ps. li. 21; Ezek. xx. 40 (emphasising of the bloodless sacrifices); cf. xliv. 29, xlv. 13, xlvi. 4 ff.; Mal. iii. 3 f.

[9] Zech. xiv. 21; Ezek. xliv. 9; B. J. lii. 1; Joel iv. 17.

[10] B. J. lx. 18. [11] Isa. i. 26; B. J. lx. 14, lxii. 2 ff.; Zech. viii. 3.

of the multitude of her children; and God will be unto her a wall of fire round about, and the glory in the midst of her.[1] Indeed, special dedication, either of men or vessels, to the service of the sanctuary will be no longer necessary. For everything will be holy, even to the bells of the horses; every pot in Jerusalem may be used for holy purposes.[2] And all who are left in Zion, written unto life in Jerusalem, will be holy.[3]

Thus what the old covenant, according to the conception of the prophetic writers, aimed at in vain, is to be actually realised—the creating of a priestly nation,[4] in which the reconciling and redeeming God is truly at one with man. The watchmen of the new Zion praise God without ceasing;[5] and before the elders of Israel there will be glory as of yore,[6] in the wonderful days of Moses, when the glory of God appeared unto them.

2. Accordingly this Israel of God obtains the fulfilment of all the ancient blessings. Above all, it is again united into one unmaimed nationality. Not only will the dispersed and scattered members of Judah return home from all the ends of the earth—the heathen guiding them back, and vying with each other in kindness and attention to them[7]—but even Ephraim unites with Judah, Ephraim of whom Jeremiah has already more hope than of Judah.[8] The ancient wound of the people is healed in concord and love.[9] The watchmen of Ephraim will be heard proclaiming a pilgrimage to Jerusalem.[10]

The boundaries of this re-established people will then be

[1] Isa. iv. 5; Zech. ii. 3–9.

[2] Zech. xiv. 20. Hence, too, no trader is any longer needed in the house of God (Zech. xiv. 21, the purification of the temple).

[3] Isa. iv. 3 (Joel iv. 17; Ezek. xliv. 9; Zech. xiv. 11; B. J. xxxv. 8).

[4] B. J. lxi. 6. [5] B. J. lxii. 6. [6] B. J. xxiv. 23.

[7] Amos ix. 14 f.; Micah iv. 6, v. 2; Isa. xi. 11 ff.; B. Zech. x. 8, 10; Jer. xxxi. 10, xxxii. 37; B. J. xiv. 2, xxvii. 12 ff., xliii. 5 ff.; xlix. 18, 22, lx. 4, lxvi. 20; Ezek. xxxvi. 24, xxxix. 27 ff.; Zech. viii. 7.

[8] Jer. iii. 11 ff., xxxi. 5–21.

[9] Hos. ii. 2; Isa. xi. 13; Jer. iii. 18; Ezek. xxxvii. 17, 19, 22.

[10] Jer. xxxi. 6.

those of the Canaan promised in prophecy,[1] to the fathers—from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth.[2] Consequently, the lands which were already called by the name of God,[3] Edom, Ammon, Moab, Philistia, and the desert tribes, must be brought into subjection.[4] The Philistines must, as it is once said, be incorporated in the community as slaves, like the Jebusites of old.[5] Thus Israel will "possess the nations."[6]

But this political frontier does not describe Israel's real power. All the tribes of earth will stream to this kingly people, full of gratitude, and eager for instruction. Every one will desire to belong to it.[7] Israel's King will show Himself upright and glorious.[8] Jerusalem's gates will stand open day and night to receive the fulness of the heathen.[9] Then the heathen will bring tribute to the sovereign people. Their choicest treasure will be Israel's for the services of the sanctuary.[10] Their princes will send presents to the people, and be their nursing fathers.[11] In fact, the idea occurs that the heathen—in order to render unto Israel double for his sufferings—are to become Israel's bondmen, like the Gibeonites of old, that the priestly nation may serve its God, untroubled by earthly cares.[12] Worldly weapons are used no more. For to the law that goeth forth from Zion all the nations submit without demur, so that war can no longer be thought of.[13]

[1] Gen. xv. 18 ff.

[2] Zech. ix. 7, 10; Amos ix. 12; Micah iv. 8; Isa. xxxiii. 17, xi. 14; Obad. 18–20; Ps. lxxii. 8. The Mediterranean and the Dead Sea, the Euphrates and the pathless deserts of Arabia as the frontier of the inhabited country; cf. Deut. xi. 24; Ezek. xlvii. 15 ff. Elsewhere the Wilderness, Lebanon, the Euphrates, and the Mediterranean [Josh. i. 4], or the brook of Egypt (Wady el-Arish), and the Euphrates [Gen. xv. 18].

[3] Amos ix. 12.

[4] Isa. xi. 14; Obad. 18 ff.

[5] Zech. ix. 7.

[6] B. J. liv. 3, lv. 4 f.

[7] B. J. xliv. 5; cf. B. J. xiv. 1 (Ps. lxxii. 10 f.), נלוה על, נספח על.

[8] Isa. xi. 10, xxxii. 1, xxxiii. 17.

[9] B. J. lx. 11.

[10] Isa. xviii. 7 (מֵעָם is to be read in accordance with the parallelism), xxiii. 18; Zeph. iii. 10; B. J. lx. 5–7, lxvi. 12.

[11] B. J. xlix. 23, lx. 10 f., 16.

[12] B. J. xiv. 2. lx. 7, 10, 12, lxi. 5 f., lxvi. 20 (Zech. ix. 11).

[13] Isa. ii. 3 f.; Micah iv. 3; cf. Micah v. 9; Zech. ix. 10.

Accordingly, Israel stands there as God's pleasant vineyard,[1] as the flock whose good shepherd is God,[2] whose reward is with Him.[3] He gives to Israel and to all peoples, on the holy mountain, the splendid royal feast of blessedness.[4] The people dwells in safety under trusty guardians. God is unto it a wall and pillar of fire.[5] The land produces in luxuriant abundance.[6] With the wild beasts, with every hostile power, God makes a covenant that they do no harm.[7] As in the happy reign of Solomon, they will dwell in peace, every man under his vine and under his fig-tree.[8] Early death will no more threaten the happy.[9] In fact, according to a still higher view, there is no more death, and God wipes away all tears from their faces.[10]

Jerusalem, in her wondrous splendour,[11] is now called "the city of solemn assemblies," "The Lord is there," "fear thou not."[12] The whole city is thus, as it were, a place of holy festivity. In the middle, according to Ezekiel's hope, the temple rises, and round about it are the abodes of the Prince, the Priests and the Levites.[13] The whole land is become a plain; Jerusalem alone remains exalted.[14] Her streets are thronged with joyous crowds.[15] Marriages there are all fruitful.[16] In short, she is the City of the Blest.

[1] B. J. xxvii. 2 ff.
[2] B. J. xl. 11; Ezek. xxxiv. 11.
[3] B. J. xl. 10.
[4] B. J. xxv. 6 ff.
[5] Isa. iv. 6 ff.; Ezek. xxxiv. 25, xxxvii. 26; B. J. lxii. 8 ff. (Jer. iii. 15; B. J. lx. 17).
[6] We have the safety and peaceful enjoyment of the land described most simply in Amos ix. 13 ff. and Hos. ii. 20 ff., xiv. 6 ff. More ideally in Zech. viii. 12, ix. 17, x. 1, xiv. 8; Isa. xxxii. 16-20; Jer. xxxi. 12; Ezek. xxxiv. 26; B. J. xxxv. 1 ff., lxv. 16 ff.; Joel iv. 18.
[7] Hos. ii. 20.
[8] Micah iv. 4; B. J. lxv. 20; Zech. iii. 10 (1 Kings iv. 25; cf. Jer. xxx. 10, xxxi. 27, xxxii. 43 ff., xxxiii. 12 f.).
[9] B. J. lxv. 20; Zech. viii. 4.
[10] B. J. xxv. 8.
[11] B. J. liv. 11 ff.
[12] Isa. xxxiii. 20 ff., Ezek. xlviii. 35; Zeph. iii. 16.
[13] Ezek. xlv. 1 ff., xlviii. 7 ff.
[14] Zech. xiv. 10.
[15] Jer. xxx. 19, xxxi. 4 f., 7, 12 f., xxxiii. 15 f.; Ezek. xxxvi. 10, 38, xxxvii. 26; B. J. xlix. 19 ff., liv. 1 ff., lx. 22.
[16] Jer. iii. 16; Zech. viii. 5.

Even external nature will then put on Sabbath attire, and will be free from evil, strife, and destruction. The whole world is to rejoice at the redemption of Israel.[1] From the house of God healing waters flow forth over the whole land of Canaan, quickening all they touch; and beside them trees grow whose leaves never wither; their fruits serve for food, their leaves for healing.[2] Thus the garden of Eden is again set up in Canaan. The very wilderness becomes a garden of the Lord.[3] A new heaven and a new earth receive the happy commonwealth of God.[4] The host of heaven is condemned.[5] Then begins a wonderful unchanging day.[6] The moon shines like the sun, and the sun as the light of seven days.[7] It is even said that God Himself is to His people both sun and moon.[8] The wild beasts will feed on grass like the tame, and the poisonous will do harm no more,[9] or, as it is said in a like sense, "no poisonous or ravenous beast will be found there."[10]

And this transformation—in the description of which, as is natural, the imagery of spiritual things shades off, without any distinct line of demarcation, into actual sketches of nature—is not to undergo any new change.[11] Like the new ordinances of nature, the seed of Israel is also to be for ever before God.[12] The grand features of this picture of blessedness, especially as drawn by the exilic prophets, have largely influenced the Christian picture of the future. They corre-

[1] B. J. xliv. 23, xlix. 13, lv. 12 (Rom. viii. 19).

[2] Ezek. xlvii. 1–10, 12 f.; cf. Zech. xiv. 8 (Joel iv. 18).

[3] Isa. xxxii. 15 (xxx. 23 f.); B. J. xxxv. 1 ff., xli. 17 ff., xlii. 15 ff., xliii. 19, xliv. 3, 27, li. 3, lv. 13 (of course often merely a picture of spiritual occurrences).

[4] B. J. lxv. 17, lxvi. 22.

[5] B. J. xxiv. 21.

[6] Zech. xiv. 6 f.

[7] Isa. xxx. 26.

[8] B. J. lx. 19 f.

[9] Isa. xi. 6 ff. (B. J. lxv. 25).

[10] B. J. xxxv. 9; Ezek. xxxiv. 25 (where certainly the simile of the flock is still discernible).

[11] Amos ix. 15; Zech. viii. 14 f.

[12] Jer. xxxi. 36 f., xxxiii. 25 f.; B. J. lxvi. 22, liv. 9 f.

spond to the description of "the first resurrection and the millennium," during which the commonwealth of God, consisting both of those who are still alive and of those who have risen, dwells on the rejuvenated earth.

CHAPTER XXI.

THE HEATHEN NATIONS IN THE LAST DAYS.

1. From one point of view, the heathen world is regarded by the religion of Israel as the power which sets itself deliberately to oppose the kingdom of God, and toward which the kingdom of God must in turn assume a defensive and offensive attitude. The world is, then, the haughty, self-sufficient power which forgets God,[1] which, in the pride of its heart, expects "to ascend into heaven, to exalt its throne above the stars of God, to sit on the mount of assembly in the furthest North (the Asiatic Olympus), to ascend above the heights of the clouds, and be like the Eternal." [2] It is the unfriendly nation,[3] which, from being a rod for the punishment of Israel's sins, has become a cruel, pitiless tormentor, or a spectator maliciously gloating over his misfortunes.[4] It then embodies in itself the idea of "the world," that is, of antagonism to the divine order of things.[5]

In every age, of course, it is the political situation that determines which particular people stands before the eye of the prophets as the representative of this world-power. Almost all the nations that ever came into historical contact with Israel

[1] Ps. ix. 18; Jer. xlviii. 26, 42, xlix. 16; Obad. 3, etc.
[2] B. J. xiv. 13; cf. Isa. x. 8 ff.; Jer. l. 11, 24, 31, li. 7, 34, 53; Ezek. xxv. 8.
[3] Ps. xliii. 1.
[4] Isa. x. 5–12; Zech. i. 15 ff.; cf. Amos. i. 3–13; Nahum i. 9, iii. 19; Obad. 10–12; Ezek. xxv. 3, 6, 12, 15, xxvi. 6, xxxv. 5, 12 ff., xxxvi. 2, 5; Zeph. ii. 8 f.; Lam. ii. 16; B. J. xlvii. 6 f.; Joel iv. 2 ff., 19.
[5] B. J. lxiii. 5, 6.

are at some time or other so represented, although at other times they are more mildly judged. Sometimes it is Canaan, sometimes Egypt,[1] Syria,[2] Kedar,[3] Phœnicia,[4] Greece,[5] or Philistia.[6] For a very long time it is Assyria and Babylon. In Ezekiel's sketch of the future, it is Gog and Magog.[7] In the Maccabean age it is the kingdom of the Seleucidæ; in the Christian era it is Rome, the modern Babylon. But those who are most strongly and constantly represented in this light are the petty neighbouring peoples which, although in some instances closely akin to Israel, were filled with the most bitter and bloodthirsty hatred, and were always on the watch for an opportunity to injure, viz. Edom, Moab, and Ammon,[8] and partly also Philistia. In later days this whole conception is summed up in Antichrist.

The heathen world, understood in this sense, coincides with the enemies of God and the faithless in Israel. The godly must hate both as the enemies of God, must turn away from them with loathing, long for divine judgment upon them, and hail it with joy.[9] This is the healthy religious kernel in those Psalms in which the wicked are cursed. It is not so much the injury done to his individual self that excites the hatred of the godly as the sin committed against the kingdom of God. But it is quite in the nature of things that this justifiable starting-point should allow human passion to

[1] In B and C, cf. Isa. xviii. ff.; Jer. xliii., xliv., xlvi. 2 ff.; Ezek. xxix.-xxxii., Joel iv. 19.

[2] Amos i. 3; Jer. xlix. 23.

[3] Jer. xlix. 28.

[4] Amos i. 9; Ezek. xxvi. 1-xxviii. 9 (20-26); Joel iv. 4.

[5] Zech. ix. 13.

[6] Amos i. 6 ff.; Ezek. xxv. 15; Zeph. ii. 4 ff.; Jer. xlvii. 1; B. J. xiv. 29 ff.; Joel. iv. 4.

[7] Ezek. xxxviii., xxxix.

[8] Isa. xv., xvi.; Amos i. 11 ff., ii. 1 ff.; Zeph. ii. 8 ff.; Deut. xxiii. 3 ff.; B. J. xxv. 10 ff., xxxiv., lxiii. 1 ff.; Jer. xlviii., xlix.; Lam. iv. 21; Ezek. xxv. 1 ff., xxi. 28 ff., xxxv.; Joel iv. 19.

[9] Ps. xxxv. 1 ff., xl. 15, lviii. 11, lxiv. 11, lxix. 23 f., cix. 6 ff., v. 11, xli. 11, ix., xx., cxxxvii. 7; cf. Jer. x. 25, xv. 15 ff., xvii. 17 f., xviii. 21 ff., xlviii. 10.

come into play. The way in which the enemies of Israel and the enemies of the godly in Israel are spoken of, especially after the time of Ezra and under the impressions produced by religious oppression, cannot but be considered, from the standpoint of Christian morality, as conduct still tinged with human passion, and not up to the standard of Christianity. But after all it is the nobler side to which prominence is most frequently given: zeal for the house of the Lord, moral indignation at hostility to God, whether within Israel or beyond its bounds, a feeling which will never be extinguished as long as there exists true and genuine love for salvation and goodness. Such love ranks higher than that easy-going indifference to the growth of evil which characterises a weak moral nature.[1]

In so far as the heathen appear as representative of the world at enmity with God, they are threatened with the same fate as the wicked in Israel. The strokes of God will break them in pieces. In the last days God gathers them together, like "sheaves of the threshing-floor," for one final conflict with His people. In terrible confusion and ignominious ruin they perish,[2] according to Joel's description, in the Valley of Jehoshaphat.[3] Their weapons of war are broken and burned, their fortresses laid in ruins; their carcases are food for birds of prey and wild beasts.[4] For every people that will not serve God shall perish.[5] In this picture of the judgment there occur, since the sixth century, certain prominent features which have served as types for the later descriptions of hell. We see the land of Edom burning, as of yore Sodom and Gomorrha burned.[6] We see the valley of the son of Hinnom in which the great statue of Moloch stood

[1] *E.g.* Isa. x. 33 ff.; Hosea ii. 3; Micah iv. 12, vii. 16 ff.; Hagg. ii. 22 f.
[2] Zech. xii. 4 f.
[3] Joel iv. 2, 12.
[4] Nahum iii. 1 ff.; Obad. 2 ff.; Isa. xv. 1; B. J. xiii. 19 f., xxi. 9, xlvii. 1 ff.; Jer. l. 45 f.; Ezek. xxxix. 3 ff., 9 ff.
[5] B. J. lx. 12.
[6] B. J. xxxiv. 9 f.

become a field ghastly with corpses.[1] The curse-laden plain of the Dead Sea becomes "the valley of Gog's multitudes," where the shattered hosts of that tyrant lie.[2] The hostile army is depicted to us, as it perishes in horrible, living corruption.[3] And the close of the exilic book of Isaiah gives us a glimpse into a dreadful valley full of corpses, where the enemies of God, the slain of the Lord, endure damnation—everlasting putrefaction, the unquenchable flame of the funeral-pile—which perhaps implies that damnation is felt as a sort of dull pain.[4] This is the destiny of those who hate God. They must perish, that their pride may be humbled and the friends of God may triumph.

2. But the heathen are not enemies of the kingdom of God simply because they are heathen. Although shut out as non-Israelites from the kingdom of God, the majority of them are not hostile to it. Thus patriarchal legend in B, C, knows of a heathen world, which is rather friendly to the kingdom of God. Heathens enter into alliance with the patriarchs. The Egypt of Joseph is a friendly country.[5] And in both the accounts of the origin of man all nations are represented as being of one blood. Consequently the idea of humanity is looked at by this religion as one based on objective facts. In like manner Phœnicia is in later times friendly rather than hostile.[6] Egypt, and even Edom, Deuteronomy will not shut out absolutely from the commonwealth of God. Indeed, its presentation of history is remarkably favourable to Edom and Moab.[7] The Persians are for the

[1] Jer. vii. 31 f., xix. 2, 6, xxxii. 35 (2 Kings xxiii. 10). גי בני־הנם or גיא בן־הנם, γέεννα; the valley which shuts Jerusalem in on the south-west.

[2] Ezek. xxxix. 11, 15 (cf. the poetic word, Joel ii. 20).

[3] Zech. xiv. 12–15.

[4] B. J. lxvi. 16, 24 (cf. Isa. xxx. 33; Jer. vii. 33, viii. 1 ff., xii. 17, xxv. 33). The worm that dieth not (תולעתם) is, we may be sure, the "worm of putrefaction," (רמה) and the fire that is not quenched, (אשם), the fire that consumes the corpse.

[5] Gen. xiv. 13 f., xxi. 22 ff., xxvi. 26 ff., xlv. 16 ff.

[6] 1 Kings v. 1 ff., 12.

[7] Deut. xxiii. 7 (ii. 5, 8, 29).

prophets of the Exile in a special manner, the servants of God and the friends of His people.[1] Consequently there is a heathen world which does not oppose the kingdom of God. Israel is indeed God's first-born son; but this very expression implies that the other nations are also in a position to be loved by God.[2] But naturally, according to the changes of history, the several heathen nations are in this respect very differently judged. The same nation may, as was the case with Edom, Egypt, and Phœnicia, be reckoned at different times, as belonging to both kinds of heathendom.

Now it is not at all the view of the prophets, from Isaiah onwards, that this heathen world is doomed to destruction in the last days. The prophet of the Exile actually rises to the grand conception that it is waiting eagerly, though unconsciously, for God and His salvation.[3] A heathen world, it is true, in the modern sense of the word, which implies idolatry, it cannot remain. The earth is to be filled with the knowledge of the glory of God, as the waters cover the sea; the Lord shall be one, and His name one; He has sworn by Himself that to Him every knee shall bow.[4] But when it has learned from the divine judgments that Israel's God is the God of all the earth—and it is for this purpose God sends His judgments [5]—then it may quite well remain a heathen world in the ancient sense, a world of nations in the full enjoyment of prosperity and free to follow their own lines of national development. In fact, even the peoples hostile to God are never looked upon as so utterly hostile, that it is impossible to expect that among them, as among sinful Israel, judgment will leave a remnant which will produce an after-growth of converts.[6] Thus we have a picture of the people

[1] B. J. xlv. 1 ff.
[2] Ex. iv. 22; Jer. xxxi. 9.
[3] B. J. xlii. 4, li. 5.
[4] Hab. ii. 14; Zech. xiv. 9; B. J. xlv. 23.
[5] Ezek. xxv. 5, 7, 11, 17, xxvi. 6, xxviii. 22, 23, 26, xxix. 6, 9, 16, 21, xxx. 8, 19, 25 f., xxxii. 15.
[6] Isa. xix., xxiii.; Jer. xlviii. 47, xlix. 6, 11, 39; Ezek. xxix. 13 f.

of God surrounded by a world of converted nations. The Old Testament salvation broadens into universalism.

This world of nations is thought of as being converted in a variety of ways. The prophets mostly think of the judgments of God in which His almighty power is revealed.[1] The heathen then acknowledge that their "no-gods" are of no avail, that only in Jehovah is deliverance to be found.[2] This is presented in a particularly instructive way in Isaiah's prophecy of the conversion of Egypt.[3] Egypt trembles, as of old in the time of Moses, at the mere mention of the name "Judah." Through the plagues with which God threatens it, it learns to know God. But it acknowledges Him at the same time through His people. There are in Egypt five cities which speak the Jewish language and worship Jehovah; there is thus a Jewish colony, as formerly there was in Goshen. An altar is erected in the land, and a pillar at its frontier, as a sign that this land is dedicated to God, and that He will protect His people from all oppression. Then the Egyptians are converted. God heals them; they bring Him offerings and vows, and become, along with Assyria and Judah, a people of God. In like manner Zephaniah also considers conversion a result of God's judgments. But he ascribes it more directly to God's own act, who turns to the heathen a pure language, that they may call upon His name together, and form a commonwealth of God.[4] The exilic Isaiah hopes that the successes of Cyrus will convert unto Jehovah first the conqueror himself, and then all the nations that are subject to him.[5]

Along with this there goes the hope that the glory, with which the people of God shines, will convince the heathen that only in this God is true salvation to be found. This

[1] Isa. xix., xxiii.; Zech. ix. 7; B. J. xxv. 3, xlv. 6, 16, 20; Ezek. xxxviii. 23, xxxix. 6.

[2] Jer. xvi. 19; B. J. xlv. 21 ff.

[3] Isa. xix. 17–25.

[4] Zeph. iii. 9 f.

[5] B. J. xlv. 4 ff.

thought, which is already implied in the patriarchal prophecies, often rings through the utterances of the prophets,[1] and also the still higher thought that the moral beauty of Israel's laws [2] and the righteousness of the Messianic king [3] will draw to them the eyes of the heathen.

But, of course, the conversion of the nations is only conceivable through their coming into some kind of relation to the people which possesses the revelation of this true God. Only on rare occasions does the thought occur that those of the Gentile nations, who escape the great overthrow, will themselves carry the gospel of God's mighty deeds to the most distant heathen lands.[4] In most cases, Israel itself is the messenger and servant of God, who preaches God to the heathen, and lets his song of deliverance re-echo to the ends of the earth. The conversion of the heathen is connected with Israel's public worship.[5] It is to Mount Zion that the people will come as pilgrims to learn the righteousness and the law of God.[6] And the exilic prophet specially presents to us the Israel of prophecy as mission-preacher, that Israel which, as the servant of Jehovah, forms a striking contrast to the Israel of actual history. It is not enough that this Israel is the servant of Jehovah to bring back the tribes of Jacob. God means to make him a light to the heathen also, who wait for His salvation.[7] But it is deeds, divine acts, that are needed, not words and learned proofs of the truth of Old Testament doctrine. When the foes of God are seen in their weakness and misery, and the kingdom of God

[1] Micah iv. 1 ff., vii. 16 ; Jer. xii. 15 ff., iii. 17, xvi. 19 ; Ezek. xxxvi. 23, 36, xxxvii. 28 ; Zech. viii. 21–23 ; B. J. xxv. 3, lxi. 9, lxvi. 18 (Ps. xxii. 28 f., lxvii. 3 ; 1 Kings viii. 60).

[2] Deut. iv. 6 ff. ; cf. Isa. ii. 2 ff. ; B. J. lx. 3.

[3] Isa. xi. 10.

[4] B. J. lxvi. 19. The messengers sent to Ethiopia (Ezek. xxx. 9) are, probably, to be taken in another sense.

[5] B. J. xlii. 19, xlviii. 20 (Micah v. 6 ?). Is the dew only thought of as the symbol of an innumerable multitude, or as a refreshing and vivifying power ?

[6] Isa. ii. 2–4 (Micah iv.) : cf. B. J. li. 4.

[7] B. J. xlii. 4, 7 ff., xlix. 6.

in its moral beauty and blessedness, their conversion is effected by the voice of truth that is inwardly audible to all men, and by the yearning of the human heart for true happiness.

All the prophets assign to Israel a privileged position as ruler over the converted heathen world. Even the nations that are not regarded as incorporated with the people of God, like the inhabitants of the Messianic Canaan in the strict sense, are, nevertheless, represented as subject to the Messianic kingdom, like those dependencies of the great Asiatic empires which enjoyed internal self-government, so that the king of Israel becomes king of kings or suzerain.[1] They make yearly pilgrimages to Jerusalem in order to worship there and celebrate the feast of tabernacles.[2] Indeed, by a greater hyperbole still, the multitude of the Gentiles comes to a solemn service on Zion every Sabbath and every new moon.[3] Their treasures serve to beautify the public worship of God and to maintain the nation of priests that dwells before Him.[4] In fact, we not infrequently find, in vivid pictures of this hope, the relations of these peoples to Israel described by expressions borrowed from the slavish vassals of Asiatic empires.[5]

Nevertheless, in the most of the utterances regarding the last age, the real purport is as grandly universalist as is at all consistent with the belief that Israel is specially favoured as regards salvation. And not a few of the most beautiful passages put this nationalism into the background in a way that is already almost Christian. The prayer in 1 Kings viii. 41 ff. is marked by a grand spirit of universalism. According to Isaiah, Assyria, Egypt, and Israel enter into alliance on equal terms as peoples who serve God, although in the prophecy itself God's special love for Israel does find expression.[6] In

[1] For these expressions cf. Isa. xxxvi. 4; Ezek. xxvi. 7; Ezra vii. 12; Dan. ii. 37.

[2] Zech. xiv. 16. [3] B. J. lxvi. 23.

[4] Isa. xxiii. 18; cf. xviii. 7; B. J. lx. 5–7, lxi. 6; Hagg. ii. 8.

[5] *E.g.* B. J. xiv. 2, xlix. 22 f., lx. 10, 12, lxi. 5.

[6] Isa. xix. 23–25.

Jeremiah, it is said that, after the judgment, the heathen are to find mercy and be planted in the midst of Israel.[1] In Ezekiel, in the age of fulfilment, "the strangers" receive as large a share of the land as the Israelites.[2] But it is chiefly the prophets at the close of the Exile who burst the barriers of nationality. The strangers who love and serve God and keep the Sabbath, along with the maimed who as yet have no rights in the commonwealth, are to have full and equal rights, and to enjoy the same respect and happiness as the children of Israel whom they join. No external blemish, therefore, whether in nationality or in physique, is to prove a hindrance to salvation. The house of God is to be a house of prayer for all peoples.[3] The royal feast on Zion, represented under the form of a thanksgiving feast, is made for all nations. God destroys the veil of mourning that is spread over all nations alike.[4] Zion, as the holy city, becomes the spiritual centre of the whole world.[5] In short, the earth becomes a kingdom of God, the members of which enjoy on all essential matters equal rights and privileges.

The passsage which would go furthest in this direction would be B. J. lxvi. 21, were it understood as a prophecy of the admission of the heathen even to the Levitical priesthood. But in view of the position taken elsewhere in the book, this is impossible.[6] Probably it refers to the children of Israel returning home from the Dispersion, in contrast to the real community of Zion in Babylon. Rather, Israel's prerogative over the Gentiles is thought of as resembling Levi's prerogative over the other tribes. It is, therefore, a prerogative of special election, which does not injure the relation of the other peoples to salvation. All nations are, in the liturgical Psalms of the latest age, summoned as a holy choir to cele-

[1] Jer. xii. 15–17; cf. xvi. 19–21; Zeph. iii. 9.
[2] Ezek. xlvii. 22.
[3] B. J. lvi. 3–8.
[4] B. J. xxv. 6 ff.
[5] B. J. xxv. 8. xxvi. 15, etc.
[6] *E.g.* B. J. lx. 7, 10, 12, lxi. 5 f. Also in ver. 22, it is just the special position of Israel that is emphasised (lvi. 7).

brate the praises of God.[1] God's own people is represented as surrounded by a galaxy of peoples who "fear the Lord."

Consequently, the prophetic age did not think that the admission of the heathen into the kingdom of God depended on their being "Judaised." Naturally Jerusalem, with its public worship of God, its Sabbath festivals, and its freedom from abominations, is to be the common sanctuary of all nations. But of circumcision, and the other customs of the Israelitish people, the prophets are not even thinking. Their hope is for national conversions to the kingdom of God on a grand scale, not for individual "converts" to the commonwealth of Israel. In this respect Paul has shown the true tendency of the prophetic teaching.

CHAPTER XXII.

THE RESURRECTION.

1. As man in union with God has the feeling of an eternal life proof against death, so, in its covenant-fellowship with God, Israel is conscious of an imperishable national life. In both cases, owing to sin and grace, everlasting life changes into death and resurrection.

The death of the holy people is a standing feature in the picture of the future, as drawn by the prophets of the eighth and seventh centuries. Even by prophets who, like Amos, Isaiah, and Hosea, usually teach that, at least for Judah, there will only be a sifting, Ephraim's death is taken for granted. In Micah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, the death of Judah also is distinctly affirmed. When Israel offended in Baal, he also died—that is, he became subject to death. In the Exile, of course, that is no longer prophecy but fact. The Exile in Babylon is the death of the people, and the end of it is the

[1] *E.g.* Ps. lxvii. 4 ff., cxvii. 1, cxlviii. 1–3, 11–15, cl. 6.

people's resurrection. Those who return home regard death as something that lies behind them, and feel the new life of their people to be eternal.[1] It is only in the Levitical period, when the people is steadily going from bad to worse, that the prophets see that before the actual advent of salvation a new judgment is inevitable.[2]

In keeping with the metaphor of Israel's death, its deliverance is naturally spoken of as a resurrection. This expression, it is true, is not very frequent. The bringing back of the captives, the gathering of the dispersed, the rebuilding of Jerusalem, the restoring of Israel to his rest,[3] these are all phrases of much more common occurrence. But the thought of a resurrection has a specially far-reaching significance, and, therefore, deserves special consideration.

Already, in Hosea, it is said, "After two days will God revive us; on the third day He will raise us up, and we shall live before Him." He will rescue from the power of the grave, and deliver from death. Death will be annihilated. "O death, where are thy plagues? O grave, where is thy destruction?[4]" In other words, when the God of life appears, death must quit his hold of what he has already seized.

This and nothing else is the meaning also of Ezekiel's famous vision in which he sees a valley full of dry bones.[5] The only possible reference is to Israel, the people; and, in fact, it is mainly to the long-dead ten tribes as contrasted with the people of Judah.[6] These are represented as a heap of dry bones. Death took place long ago. The question being put to the prophet, Can these bones live? he replies, "Lord, Thou

[1] Hagg. i. 4 ff., 14 ff., ii. 6 ff.; Zech. i. 12–21, iii., iv., v., viii. 3 ff.; B. J. liv. 9; Ezek. xxxvi. 2 ff.

[2] Mal. ii. 12, iii. 1, 5, 19, 23 ff.

[3] The word מנוחה for Canaan (Deut. xii. 9; Ps. xcv. 11). In Micah ii. 10, the phrase, "This is not your rest," is probably not a pitiless declaration of the b. other-people to the fugitives (Hitzig) but God's sentence against Judah. In the future it is said, "To thy rest, O Israel!" (Jer. xxxi. 2).

[4] Hos. vi. 1 ff., xiii. 14.

[5] Ezek. xxxvii.

[6] Vers. 11, 17; cf. chap. xxxviii.

knowest." In other words, he has to acknowledge that, so far as man can judge, there is no hope of Israel awaking to new life. He leaves the matter with God, for whom nothing is impossible. Then he sees how the breath of God blows over this field of the dead.[1] The dry bones become living bodies. He receives the prophetic assurance, which is also specially explained to him in vers. 12–14, that Israel is to rise to a new life with all the freshness of youth.

This thought is expressed in a particularly affecting way by the author of B. J. xxiv.–xxvii. The people must go into its chamber, till the times of trouble are overpast.[2] Then there await it a new resurrection-life and the feast of fat things, which God will give unto all peoples upon Mount Zion.[3]

The life to which the people is raised up is an everlasting life. Individuals, it is true, are promised in that golden age nothing more than a long life, which is never to be prematurely cut short by a mournful death.[4] But of the people itself the prophets of the Exile declare that it will live for ever, crowned with joy and gladness;[5] that it will bloom and flourish in imperishable freshness;[6] that, living in everlasting bliss on a new earth under a new heaven, it is to witness how everything hostile to God is handed over for ever to the powers of death in the valley of judgment.[7] The prophecy in B. J. xxv. 8 goes farthest of all in promising that death will be altogether abolished in the time of consummation, so that the risen people and its then living members will enjoy an everlasting life of blessednesss.

[1] The "Spirit" of God, according to the double meaning of the word, made perceptible to the senses as storm.

[2] B. J. xxvi. 20 f.

[3] B. J. xxvi. 6 ff. This little book is the original of many of the Jewish figures in the New Testament. The "travail of the Messiah," the "marriage supper," the "marriage of the Lamb," the "destruction of death for evermore," are still heard echoing through New Testament prophecy. We may even say that the blessedness of the first-born, the millennium, and the new Jerusalem, are probably to be found here in their earliest and simplest features.

[4] B. J. lxv. 20; Zech. viii. 4.

[5] B. J. xxxv. 10.

[6] B. J. lxv. 18–23.

[7] B. J. lxvi. 22 f.

2. It came naturally within the religious scope of the thought last expounded to include in Israel's resurrection from the dead the individual also, in so far as he is a member of the holy nation. Consequently, it would not surprise us, were we to find, any time after Hosea, a doctrine of the resurrection of the godly children of Israel. If, on the contrary, Israel awoke to the consciousness of such a hope only at a late period, and very gradually, this is explained by the fact that the personality of the individual is invariably put in the background by the collective personality of the people. In Hosea, chap. vi., there is no reference to a resurrection of individual members of the holy nation already dead. And I must make a similar assertion about Ezekiel xxxvii. Undoubtedly the real reference of this passage is to the people of Israel. Some might, indeed, find in the very simile used by the prophet, a proof that a resurrection of the dead was a thought with which pious minds were then familiar. But it seems to me to prove the very opposite. If the belief in a resurrection of individuals had been known to the prophet, then his reply to the question "Will these live?" must surely have been, "Certainly, Lord!" And in that case, this whole vision would be no longer a sign. The field full of dead men's bones would no longer be an emblem of a hopelessness too great for human thought to overcome, nor the raising of the bones a miracle of miracles. On the contrary, the bones would of themselves be a sign of hope; and their being raised would be an event to be expected as a matter of course. Instead of a miraculous pledge of something otherwise incredible, we should have a rather weak parable: "As certainly as these corpses will rise again, so certainly will dead Israel also be raised from the dead." Consequently this passage was well suited to arouse in the reader a belief in the resurrection of individuals also. But a proof that such a belief already existed, it most assuredly is not. B. J. xxxv. 10, lxv. 20; and Zech. viii. 4, do not

assume, that even in the time of consummation, the godly will be perfectly free from death or sin. Zech. iii. 7 has absolutely nothing to do with the question before us, but is simply a symbolical promise to the high priest of Israel, as the representative of his people, that he will constantly enjoy free access to God, and be graciously received.

On the other hand, there are certainly two passages in the book of Isaiah where we meet with the thought of the resurrection of the godly. Let us first take the famous passage about the suffering servant of Jehovah in B. J. liii. 10 ff. There is here, of course, no doctrine of the resurrection of the dead. The servant of Jehovah is not, in the strict sense, an individual person, although a very vivid and concrete personification. And, at any rate, he is meant to be something absolutely extraordinary; and his resurrection can no more prove the belief in a general resurrection than the instance of Enoch is a proof that all men escape death. Still we have here quite distinctly the thought of a blessed and endless life, to which the righteous rises after he has died, and been buried,—a step, therefore, towards a real hope of resurrection.[1]

The hope in B. J. xxiv.–xxvii. goes still further. Here, also, it is true, it is only the resurrection of the people that is primarily kept in view throughout. It is the people that is addressed. And in reference to individual men we get, speaking generally, only the hopeless utterance, "Dead men do not live again, shades do not rise."[2] But the prophet expects primarily, at least for those who share in the age of consummation, perfect freedom from death.[3] And when, in glancing at the final era, he remembers those who died before salvation actually arrived, it is at first but an eager wish which rises within him, "May thy dead live, may my

[1] In B. J. lvii. 1 f., death is spoken of "as a shelter from wickedness," but without any clear hint of restoration to real life.

[2] B. J. xxvi. 14 (doubtless of Israel's enemies). [3] B. J. xxv. 8.

corpses arise,"[1] a wish, full both of earnest longing and of resignation, like the exclamation of Job, "Oh that a clean one might come out the unclean." But to the prophetic eye this wish becomes a joyous hope:

> "Awake and sing, ye that dwell in the dust:
> For thy dew is as the dew of light,
> And the earth will bring forth shades."[2]

Thus it is only towards the close of the Exile that prophecy shows traces of a resurrection hope, and even these are always given with the indefiniteness characteristic of poetry, and are very far indeed from being a distinct doctrine. They rather hint at a belief in process of formation than formulate one already held. And the Psalms, from which it is thought that a more definite hope of salvation can be proved, really carry us no further than do the passages previously cited. Since Ps. xvi. and xvii. have been already discussed, the only others bearing on the question are Ps. xlix., lxxiii., and cxxxix., all of them late.[3] The singer of Psalm xlix. announces in a significant introduction,[4] replete with promises, that he wishes to solve, in accordance with divine wisdom, a question of moment for all—the question, how is the prosperity of the wicked compatible with divine Providence? the same question which rings throughout the book of Job. He solves it in two equal strophes, containing eight verses each.[5] The first strophe deals with the lot of men in general. Since rich and poor must go down to Sheol, since riches do not ransom, and no one takes them with him, what matters it that a wicked man is rich and powerful? He is fleeting, evanescent, yea, a nothing. But the second strophe goes further. It is not merely that men are alike, that riches and power make no real difference in the final destiny; but the fools whom

[1] B. J. xxvi. 19 (מתיך, נבלתי). [2] B. J. xxvi. 19.

[3] The text of these Psalms, nearly all through, is so uncertain, and so far from leaving the impression of originality, that they are, from this one fact, quite unsuitable as proof-passages.

[4] Ps. xlix. 2–5. [5] Ps. xlix. 6–13 and 14–21.

men praise must away to the under world, while God delivers the godly.[1] Hence it is foolish to be afraid of the wicked, whose power and riches soon fall a prey to destruction.[2] The line of thought in both strophes, beautifully emphasised as it is by the refrain, with its significant changes, is on all essential points above doubt. The only disputable and, for our question, important passage is II*a*. (14–16 inclusive).

The words run as follows :—

> "This is the way of them that are stubborn :
> And after them follow those who delight in their sayings :
> Like sheep they are appointed for Sheol ;
> Death is their shepherd :
> And the upright trample upon them ;
> Right soon must their form wither away :
> Sheol is the dwelling-place for them.[3]
> But God redeems my soul from the power of Sheol :
> For He keeps hold of me."[4]

Here there is certainly nothing about a resurrection of the godly, or about a life exempt from death. For death in the abstract is thought of as the common lot of all (vers. 11 and 13); and redemption from the hand of Sheol, which is already laying hold of the godly, is, as ver. 8 clearly shows, merely an expression meaning "to protect from death," and that, of course, not from death absolutely, but (as is proved by a host of similar expressions),[5] from the penal death of the wicked. The death of the fool, of which the last strophe speaks, is the antithesis, not of the immortality of the godly, but of their confidence and rest in God. This would indeed preclude the punish-

[1] Vers. 14–16. [2] Vers. 17–21.

[3] Death watches the wicked as they lie massed together like a flock. The upright triumph. Towards morning, *i.e.* suddenly, as the night vanishes, their form must wither (read לִבְלוֹת=יִבְלֶה). Hades is their dwelling-place (מִזְּבֻל according to the Massoretes, is probably to be taken : "it (their bodily form) will be without a dwelling," but that is meaningless ; מזבל must be a rare nominal formation for זְבוּל, B. J. lxiii. 15).

[4] Or else, "when it lays hold of me," clutches at me. God takes hold of the upright, and thus snatches him away from the threatening violence of death.

[5] *E.g.* Jonah ii. 3, 7 ; Ps. ix. 14, lxxxvi. 13, lxxxix. 49, ciii. 4, cxxxviii. 7.

ment of an *early death*, but not a normal end to life. Finally, "He keeps hold of me," in ver. 16, is not at all synonymous with "He awakes me," or such like, but means,—He lays hold of me, and so snatches me away, *i.e.* in the given case, from the hand with which death was clutching at me.

In Ps. lxxiii. a godly man is busying himself still more distinctly and clearly with the problem of the prosperity of the wicked. He thinks it completely solved by the joyous belief that the apparent happiness of the wicked must give place to sudden destruction, and that God, on the other hand, raises the godly to honour. Here, too, in my opinion, there is no reference to any recompense in the world to come. The experience which gives the psalmist his solution of the problem is confined to this life; he feels happy in God, and sees the downfall of the wicked whom once he envied.

The line of thought in the Psalm is as follows—Vers. 1–3: Now I know of a truth that God is good to the pious, although when I saw the prosperity of the wicked, I had almost sinned against God, and had nearly become wicked myself. Vers. 4–15 incl.: For I found that the wicked, in spite of the most insane pride and arrogance toward God, continued unpunished and happy, while nothing but suffering fell to the lot of the godly; and so I had almost slipped. But now I have found the right standpoint. Vers. 16–20 incl.:

> "When I thought how I might know this,
> It was labour in mine eyes;
> Until I went into the sanctuaries[1] of God,
> And considered their (wicked men's) latter end.
> Surely Thou settest them in slippery places:
> Thou castest them down as ruins.
> How are they become a desolation in a moment!
> They are utterly consumed with terrors.[2]
> As a dream when one awaketh,
> So Thou, Lord, when Thou awakest, shalt despise their image."

---

[1] Represented as local: the place where one finds God, *i.e.* His secrets, the true meaning of God's plans.

[2] Sc. killed by terror.

Vers. 21, 22: Hence I was a fool, to get angry at the prosperity of the wicked.

Vers. 23–28 incl.:

> "And as for me, I am continually with Thee:
> Thou hast holden my right hand.
> By Thy counsel thou guidest me,
> And that I may obtain glory, Thou dost keep hold of me.[1]
> Whom have I in heaven but Thee?
> And apart from Thee I have no pleasure on earth.[2]
> Though my flesh and my heart faileth,
> God is the rock of my heart and my portion for ever.[3]
> For, lo, they that are far from Thee shall perish:
> Thou destroyest every one that goeth a whoring from Thee.
> And as for me, nearness to God is my happiness.[4]
> I have made the Lord God my refuge,
> That I may tell of all Thy works."

Let a reader do justice to the poetic cast of this Psalmist's phraseology, bear in mind how often similar hyperbolical expressions are used, and notice how, even in the most crucial parts of the Psalm, *e.g.* vers. 26–28, 18–20, the sole emphasis is laid on the judgment by which the wicked is swept off the face of the earth, and how the closing stanza still speaks throughout only of earthly happiness,—and he will be convinced that here also the poet means his question to be solved, not by resur-

[1] Ver. 23 is neither a hope nor a resolution, but an account of his experience. God guides him in his counsel, *i.e.* wisely, and keeps hold of him that he may obtain glory, as the phrase according to Zech. ii. 12 [Eng. ii. 8] undoubtedly means. In other words, "Thou leadest me wisely, so that the end may be glory, not shame." Another rendering might be, "And, after that, glory will receive me," which also need not refer to anything more than the goal of earthly life. "Thou wilt receive me into glory," would require either לְכָבוֹד or בְּכָבוֹד.

[2] Thus God is his highest good (cf. Ps. xvi. 2). The עִמָּךְ (like the עָלֶיךָ of Ps. xvi. 2), means along with Thee, apart from Thee. In other words, apart from God he has no happiness either in heaven or on earth.

[3] Even when in the greatest danger of death, he puts his trust in God; for he knows that the wicked perish, and that the pious enjoy the favour of God. The reasoning in ver. 27 makes it clear that in ver. 26 he cannot be speaking of death, but only of danger of death.

[4] To be near to God, that is, that I may cleave to Him (B. J. lviii. 2) is sufficient happiness for me.

rection after death, but by the rest, blessedness, and security of earthly life.

Psalm cxxxix. is still clearer. There the literal meaning must be thoroughly distorted before any reference to the resurrection can be discovered. The poet has constructed his Psalm as follows—1–6 incl.: O God, Thou hast, in Thine unsearchable greatness surrounded me everywhere with Thy wisdom and Thy power. 7–12 incl.: Nowhere can one hide from Thee: since for Thee darkness is not. Were I to say, "Let utter darkness enshroud me, and the light about me become night," even darkness would not be dark for Thee, but night would be light as day, and darkness be as light. 13–16 incl.: For Thou hast known me, even in the darkness of the womb; I give thanks unto Thee, for I am fearfully and wonderfully made: wonderful are Thy works; and that my soul knoweth right well."[1] . . . "Thine eyes saw me as an embryo, and in Thy book were they all written, even the days which were ordained, when as yet was none of them."[2] 17, 18: All this I can neither understand nor express—"How precious also are Thy thoughts unto me, O God! how great is the sum of them! If I should count them, they are more in number than the sand; I awake, so am I still with Thee."[3] In other words, whether I wake or sleep, I am constantly under the mighty influence of Thy wonderful works. If I fall asleep while pondering their inexhaustible variety, still they occupy my dreams. 19–22 incl.: O God, destroy the

[1] Ver. 13. "Before God the darkness is as light, for He has seen even that which is hidden deepest." Ver. 14. "Come into being in a way as astonishing as it is remarkable." (Hitzig: "Thou hast shown Thyself astonishingly wonderful." Sept. Syr. נִפְלָאתָ.)

[2] גֹּלֶם probably better "embryo" than "the threads of life, thought of as still in a skein." Q'ri, Hitzig: "And for it (*i.e.* for his birth into the world) there was one of them."

[3] Meditation that does not cease even in dreams. Otherwise we might think of "the waking heart," Song of Sol. v. 2; Job iv. 13; Jer. xxxi. 26. There cannot possibly be a reference to the resurrection: (1) because death has not been even mentioned; (2) because, in that case, עוֹדִי could not be used, for only then would he be really with God, and that, too, in quite a different sense.

wicked, whom I hate as being Thine enemies! 23, 24: Prove me, and lead me to salvation.

Consequently, these Psalms contribute nothing towards a doctrine of the resurrection. And it is hardly possible that any one would, in sober earnest, interpret the exclamation of God in Ps. xc. 3, "Return, ye children of men," as a summoning of men to a resurrection life.[1] The Levitical age was the first to produce a clear and positive doctrine of the resurrection.[2] The book of Daniel knows of a resurrection of many, that is, of a resurrection which does not result from the circumstances of mankind in general, from the natural constitution, so to speak, of a human being, but is connected with the perfecting of Israel at the end of the days.[3] This resurrection also presupposes a judgment—that is, the prophet expects a resurrection even of the wicked in Israel. Those sleeping in the dust of the earth awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt.[4] Hence all Israel is probably included in this hope, so that the resurrection brings to the members of this people both purification and judgment. But this book nowhere gives us any warrant for going beyond Israel.

This doctrine was, it is true, not accepted by Israel without discussion, a clear proof that it was a doctrine of the schools, founded on the teaching of the scribes. The book of

[1] It simply corresponds to תשב עד־דכא.

[2] Whether the Persian doctrine of resurrection has had any influence, cannot be of essential interest to us, since it would, at any rate, only be a question as to strengthening an element already in existence. This point will be the more difficult to decide, the more uncertain it becomes how far this doctrine, the principal witness to which is Bundehesh, was really old Persian.

[3] Dan. xii. 2. The "many" is probably not used as an antithesis to "all," but is meant simply to express, as in Rom. v. 15, that a large number, a majority, will share in it. In my opinion, ver. 13 also refers to this idea, as is shown by the phrase, "at the end of the days." The verse runs thus, "And go thou to the goal," that is, finish thy course, "and rest (in death) and stand in thy lot," that is, receive the portion destined for thee at the end of the time.

[4] Dan. xii. 2, then in ver. 3, "the teachers," are thought of as specially honoured.

Ecclesiastes still holds by the older Israelitish view, and that too in its most negative aspect. For this book it is a very doubtful matter whether there is any existence after death worth speaking of. It is doubtful whether a human life, on account of its personal communion with God, will be taken up by Him after its death;[1] while the life of an animal, being connected with nature, returns to that out of which it came. And even if one assumes this, as soon as God takes back the living spirit which He has lent to man, there remain only "the dead," the shades in Sheol, who are without feeling, without hope.[2] The living know that they must die; the dead know nothing. A dead lion is worse than a living dog.[3] There is a place to which all go, an eternal home.[4] The dust returns to the earth, and the spirit to Him who gave it, and who, whenever He pleases, can take it back.[5]

Now, many expositors have, it is true, taken this "living spirit" to mean man's personal conscious life, and have thus found in the book the doctrine that the spiritual part of man, his true Ego, enters at death into (blessed) fellowship with God.[6] They were confirmed in this by the book speaking of all men being inevitably judged by God, of an account that must be given to Him, and of an eternity which He has put in the heart of man.[7] Were this interpretation right, the last sections of the book must have been written from a standpoint quite different from that of the rest of the book. They must either indicate a complete triumph of faith, for which nothing in the tone of the book gives any warrant; or they must come from a different author, who wished to soften what was objectionable in the book, a view against which the similarity of diction and the coherence of the argument are conclusive. But the living spirit is here, as everywhere else

[1] Eccles. iii. 18 ff.; cf. xii. 7.
[2] Eccles. iii. 20, viii. 8, xii. 7, ix. 3.
[3] Eccles. ix. 3–10.
[4] Eccles. iii. 20, vi. 6.
[5] Eccles. xii. 7, viii. 8.
[6] Eccles. xii. 7.
[7] Eccles. iii. 11, 17, xi. 9 (xii. 14, Kahle).

in the Old Testament, not the personal, conscious, spiritual side of man—the soul—but the vital force common to all living beings, the condition of earthly life for man and beast, of which it is said, "were He to withdraw their breath, they would crumble into dust."[1] And the judgment is, as is so frequently the case, the judgment in this world which God passes on man by his lot in life, and above all by his death. Otherwise this judgment could not be mentioned for the purpose of exhorting readers to rejoice in their youth. In that case it would have had to run: "Enjoy youth, but don't forget the judgment." Here, as elsewhere in the book, the author means, by this mention of the inevitable doom of death, to exhort to a cheerful, thankful enjoyment, as in the sight of God, of life and its pleasures in a pure sense.[2]

This double-sided view of the final destiny of man is still more strongly marked in the apocryphal books. The second book of Maccabees deals with the subject quite in the fashion of Daniel. For its author the resurrection is a dogma sufficiently important to make him give prominence to the fact that even Judas Maccabeus acknowledged his belief in it by offering sacrifices for the dead.[3] All Israelites, even the wicked,[4] whom of course judgment awaits, will rise out of Hades. The death of the body is, it is true, constantly regarded as a punishment for sin.[5] But God, from whom no one can escape, will raise up the bodies of the true children of Israel.[6] The only thing that admits of doubt is whether the book includes non-Israelites in the resurrection. It might seem so, since the heathen tyrant is threatened with terrible retribution because of his outrageous conduct against God.[7] But since in this case the retribution is to be inflicted

[1] Cf. Ps. i. 5, vii. 7, xxxvii. 37, ix. 5, 8; Gen. xviii. 25; Ezek. xviii. 30.

[2] Eccles. xi. 9 f.; cf. iii. 22 (cf. the well known Egyptian custom of showing at their feasts a dead man's head).

[3] 2 Macc. xii. 43 f.

[4] 2 Macc. xii. 43 f.; cf. vi. 26.

[5] 2 Macc. vii. 18, 32, 38.

[6] 2 Macc. vi. 26, vii. 9, 14, 23, 36.

[7] 2 Macc. vii. 17, 19, 31, 35, 36.

on the descendants as well, since "the issue" is to confirm the threat,[1] and since the only menace addressed to the tyrant himself is, that he will not enjoy a resurrection unto life,[2] it is hardly to be supposed that a resurrection to everlasting punishment is thought of; probably all that is meant is a resurrection of the members of the holy, national body, corresponding to "the first resurrection" of the New Testament. The book of Judith, on the other hand, following B. J. lxvi. 24, holds that the heathen hostile to God will have to live in a sort of hell of conscious torment.[3]

In the book of Enoch the doctrine of the resurrection is worked out still more fully on these lines. In addition to the righteous who, like Enoch and Elijah, are already living in the north in blessed communion with God, in the holy place of the great King,[4] there are also dead men, in separate divisions of Sheol till the judgment, in very different conditions, ranging from misery to blessedness.[5] On the day of judgment the pious take the reins of government, and, as destroyers of the wicked, enjoy a long life of blessedness and joy upon earth, upon a new earth under a new heaven.[6] The elect rise to blessedness and sinlessness.[7] But all must rise: for none perish or can perish before God.[8] Then heaven and hell are the alternatives.[9] A description of them, of the tree of life, and the tree of knowledge, or of the eschatological monsters Leviathan and Behemoth, and such like, is not a part of our task.[10] In Ezra iv., in the Jewish Sibyl, and in the Psalms of Solomon, there is likewise found the doctrine of the resurrection of the godly.[11]

[1] 2 Macc. vii. 17, ix. 5 ff. [2] 2 Macc. vii. 14. [3] Jud. xvi. 20 ff.
[4] Enoch xxxvii. 4, xxv. 5, lxx. 1, 4, lxxxix. 52. [5] Enoch xxii. 3 ff.
[6] Enoch xcviii. 12 f., v. 9, x. 17 ff., lviii., xxv. 6, lxxii. 1, xci. 10.
[7] Enoch xci. 10, 23, 17, v. 8. [8] Enoch li. 1 ff., lxi. 5.
[9] Enoch cviii. 4 ff.
[10] Cf. *e.g.* Enoch lxvii. 4 ff., lxviii. 5, xci. 15, xc. 26, x. 12, lx. 7 ff., lxxx. 2 ff., xxiv., xxv., xxxii. 3 ff.
[11] Ps. iii. 13 ff., xiii. 9, xiv. 2. The book, Ezra iv., clearly presupposes the destruction of the wicked. Their wicked acts have effects even after the death

This view of the last things was adopted by the sect of the Pharisees, and by the pious people whose religious development was mainly due to their influence.[1] If Josephus has not somewhat modified the teaching of the Pharisees in a sense friendly to Greek philosophy, there were at work, in the sect itself, influences of a more spiritualistic character; for they were not kept together by a rigid uniformity of dogma so much as by exact conformity to the legal regulations of practical life. In that case they would have accepted a natural immortality of the soul, and retribution immediately after death, and would have expected none but the blessed to obtain a new body.[2] But on such points Josephus is a witness not at all above suspicion.[3]

On the other hand, there appears in the book of Baruch,[4] and in Jesus the son of Sirach, just the old Mosaic view of death and the condition after death, without any reference to the prophetic elements which point to the vanquishing of death. The latter book, undoubtedly, assumes a continued existence in Sheol and the possibility of influencing the course of events,[5] even while there; and it as good as takes for granted not only the possibility of being miraculously preserved from death, but also the possibility of being miraculously brought back from Sheol.[6] In several passages, one might infer a final judgment on the wicked in the other world.[7] But this is only spoken of in connection with some histories of the Old Testament, *e.g.*

of the body. The multitude "born without an object" (ix. 22, xiii. 9, xiv. 6, xv. 11), is destroyed, while the pious, hidden in the womb of Sheol (iv. 35), are then born of it anew unto life (iv. 41, v. 37, xiv. 34, x. 16, vii. 32, viii. 54). Ezra himself, and those like him, pass, it is true, without dying, into life eternal (vi. 26, viii. 52, xiv. 9). The description of the final judgment (vii. 33 ff.), does not exclude the idea of a judgment day in this world (xv. 13).

[1] *E.g.* Acts xxiii. 6, xxiv. 15, xxvi. 8; John v. 28, vi. 44, xi. 24.

[2] Joseph. *De Bell. Jud.* ii. 8, 14; *Ant.* xviii. 1, 3.

[3] His own view is still more platonising, *De Bell. Jud.* iii. 8, 5.

[4] Bar. ii. 17; cf. iii. 10, 11, 19.

[5] Ecclus. xlvi. 20.

[6] Ecclus. xliv. 16, xlviii. 5, 10, 12, 14.

[7] Ecclus. i. 13, ii. 18, vii. 36 ff., xli. 12.

Enoch, Elijah, and Samuel. The general conception of the book however makes it clear that judgment just consists in death itself,[1] in the way in which it befalls the individual, in posthumous fame,[2] and in the lot of one's posterity;[3] while death, in itself, is represented as a misfortune common to all,[4] and as the end of all joy and pleasure, of all distinction and all decision.[5] The passages which go beyond this are probably, like several statements about "wisdom," the work of the translator who was naturally under the influence of the religious philosophy of the Egyptian Jews. The view in Tobit, and in the first book of the Maccabees, appears to be similar, although this conclusion can be drawn only from their silence as to any opposing view.[6] This was certainly the position which the party of the Sadducees took up in regard to the matter. They can hardly have denied the existence of the dead in Sheol, which is, indeed, a matter of complete religious indifference. But they certainly denied the doctrine of immortality and of a resurrection, that is to say, the prophetic hope of the Israelites.[7]

In the last pre-Christian age there occurs yet a third view of man's destiny after the death of the body which, under the guidance of the spiritualistic philosophy of that period, goes quite beyond the Old Testament doctrine of death and of the condition after death. It is really founded on a belief in the divine nature of the human soul, and in its preexistence, from which it follows as a matter of course that only on the dissolution of the body is the soul restored to its true mode of life. Of the Apocrypha proper, the book of Wisdom shows traces of this view. True, the view of

[1] Ecclus. xiv. 20, xxxviii. 22, xli. 2 f.
[2] Ecclus. xl. 9 f., xli. 1 ff., li. 8 ff.
[3] Ecclus. xi. 29, xv. 17, xxiii. 21, 35, xxx. 4 f., xli. 5 f.
[4] Ecclus. x. 11 f., xiv. 17, xvii. 25, xxii. 9, xxxviii. 16 f.
[5] Ecclus x. 12, xiv. 13 ff., xvii. 22 ff., xviii. 22, xli. 5 ff.
[6] Cf. 1 Macc. xiv. 31; Tob. iii. 6, 10 (otherwise in the redacted Tobit).
[7] Matt. xxii. 23; Acts xxiii. 8; Joseph. *De Bell. Jud.* ii. 8, 14; *Ant.* xviii. 1, 4.

this book is still in very close accordance with the Old Testament pre-suppositions. With the support of Scripture it teaches that God did not create death, that the original sources of the world are permanent, with no poison of destruction in them, Hades having no throne on earth;[1] that the wicked called death in, and that, while God had created man for immortality, death came in through the envy of the devil.[2] The book speaks of a day of judgment when the righteous are the judges, and of the miserable end of the wicked.[3] Nevertheless, there are clear enough indications of that other view. For the godly death is happiness and a gift from God.[4] Their soul is, by nature, immortal;[5] and, even before the judgment, it is in a state of blessedness.[6] The resurrection of the body is never taken into consideration.[7] The thought of an everlasting existence in Hades is wicked and foolish.[8] It is quite in harmony with this that, along with the ordinary view of man's development,[9] it is clearly enough assumed that every soul has already a good or an evil bias before it is put into the earthen vessel of the body—that, of course, being good or bad according to the nature of the soul.[10] This view appears to have been that of the Essenes, who spoke simply of "the immortality of the soul."[11] It is stated, in all its peculiarities, by Philo, who holds that the soul is an imperishable principle,[12] and that death is a release from the bonds of the body.[13]

[1] Wisd. Sol. i. 12 ff.
[2] Wisd. Sol. ii. 23 ff.
[3] Wisd. Sol. iii. 8, 10, 19, iv. 19.
[4] Wisd. Sol. iii. 6, iv. 9–14.
[5] Wisd. Sol. iii. 1, 4 ff., iv. 7, v. 15 f., xvi. 14.
[6] Wisd. Sol. ii. 22, iii. 1 ff., iv. 7.
[7] Wisd. Sol. iii. 1 ff., iv. 7.
[8] Wisd. Sol. ii. 1 ff., v. 1 ff.
[9] Wisd. Sol. vii. 1 ff.
[10] Wisd. Sol. viii. 19 f., ix. 15.
[11] Joseph. *Ant.* xviii. 1, 5.
[12] Philo 131 E, 216 B, 345 C, 466 C, 585 E, 586 D; cf. 31 A, D, 33 D, 47 C, D, 171 D, 172 B, 300 B.
[13] Philo 59 D, 700, 728, 1090 D; cf. 216 B, 345 C, 586 C, 1153 C.

(*b*) *The Human Instruments for Establishing the Kingdom of God.*

CHAPTER XXIII.

THE DAVIDIC KING IN THE LAST AGE.

1. All that we have hitherto said regarding the future of salvation, which the prophets expected, has pointed solely to God Himself as the author of its fulfilment. As the beginnings of that salvation are due to God, so also is its completion. And this is the characteristic feature, all through, of the prophecies and the songs of the Old Testament. All second causes, and all created instruments, the divine omnipotence casts wholly into the shade. But this divine causality is, in itself, in no way exclusive of human instrumentality. Even in early days God had made a covenant,—but through Moses and Aaron. He had delivered His people,—but by the hand of David, His anointed. He had spoken,—but by the mouth of the men of God the prophets. God comes to man by equipping men to spread abroad His Spirit, to speak His words, to do His deeds. Hence, the future salvation is likewise represented as brought about by the human instruments God employs.

True, the prophets do not all speak of the future salvation being effected by this human instrumentality, at least not in the fragments of their preaching that have come down to us. In Nahum, Habakkuk,[1] Zephaniah, B. J. xiii., xiv., and xxiv.–xxvii., Joel, and Obadiah, we do not find a hint of it, a proof that hope's religious centre of gravity does not lie in the personality of this mediator. No doubt, the most of the prophets, and the

[1] For the Messiah of Hab. iii. 13 is the people itself.

most important of them too, regard the future of salvation as bound up with special human activity, and with outstanding human personages. God is the Saviour of Israel, when He raises up for him a Saviour, a Deliverer who champions and delivers like Moses of old.[1] And those human figures, which had acquired a typical significance for the history of salvation, naturally stood before the eye of the prophets as patterns.

The most important of these figures is the Davidic king, the real representative of independent nationality in Israel, the kingdom of God. At first it is, for the prophets, a question merely of the kingdom as such. But ere long it is a particular king, clearly depicted as a person whom they expect at the end of the ages. And this personage towers so high above all the other figures of that closing era, that the name "Messiah" could become the technical term for the whole hope of Israel.

Here the Davidic kingdom alone is taken into consideration. By the eighth century the prophets have long ago ceased to know anything of that first antagonism to the house of David, which had caused in the disruption of the kingdom. Compared with the grand figure of David, and the divine promises relating to his house, the rulers of Ephraim are represented as ungodly kings, as instruments of punishment in the hand of God. Even in the northern kingdom itself, and as a citizen of it, Hosea points to "king David," that is, to the reigning house of David, to whom, as well as to their God, the ten tribes must return.[2] And the Judean Amos, who had migrated from his ruined home into the haughty splendour of the northern kingdom, is sure that the fallen tabernacle of David's house is to be again set up, and that it will then effect salvation.[3] Even during Israel's worst days the memory of the everlasting mercies of David—that is, of the divine blessing that rests on his house, is still

[1] Isa. xix. 20. [2] Hos. iii. 5. [3] Amos ix. 11.

cherished by the people, and continues to be the leading idea in the prayers offered by the godly.[1]

The figure of the Davidic king of the last days is not equally prominent in every age. It does not stand before the spirit of the prophets as supernaturally ready and complete, nor does it develop, as an idea does, growing gradually clearer and clearer. Its form is largely determined by history, and shares in its mutations. At one time it steps to the front, strikingly beautiful and glorious; at another, it draws back into the shade, or grows faint and pale. This fact is, of course, also connected with the spiritual life of the prophets, a factor beyond the reach of examination. But in the main it can be understood in the light of history. Hosea and Amos give prominence to the house of David, simply because of the contrast it affords to the wild dynastic confusion in Ephraim. It is as a glorious personality that the son of David appears in Isaiah, Micah, and Zechariah ix.–xi. Probably the hopes that centred on Hezekiah as the successor of the profligate Ahaz, encouraged such thoughts. In Jeremiah, Zechariah xii.–xiv., and Ezekiel, the picture of the coming Davidic king is faithfully retained. But it is much less ideal than before; it is rather only a single feature in the picture of the nation's hope. These men make righteousness and moral worth the main traits of the Messiah's character, a true expression of those ages when the outward splendour of the Davidic house had suffered so ignominious a collapse, because its inner worth was utterly gone. In the time of the Exile the Davidic king keeps quite in the shade. The royal house, sunk as it was in the depths of disgrace, is no longer the centre of the religious hope of the nation. Quite a different figure now steps to the front, the Israel of prophecy which, by suffering and death, accomplishes the will of its God. The Persian monarch is here called "the Messiah of God." The true

[1] Ps. lxxxix., cxxxii.

Saviour of Israel lives on earth, while a stranger as king of the world must help forward the purposes of God. But when the congregation of Israel returned home under Zerubbabel, a son of David, the figure of the king once more got its due. In the person of its leader the people had a pledge, a man who was Himself a sign, that the great Davidic "sprout" of the future was about to come. It is in this sense that the prophets of the new Jerusalem, Haggai and Zechariah, point to the Prince. But in Malachi's days the figure of the Davidic king had again lost its significance for religious life in Israel.

2. Like Amos and Hosea, Isaiah also spoke in the second half of his career, not so much of a single divine Son of David as of the time when the royal house, being transfigured like Israel in general, would reign over the people in the splendour of wisdom and righteousness.[1] But in the prophecies of his youth he not only promised that a future Deliverer would arise from the house of David, but also depicted him in the most glowing colours.

The Messiah first appears in Isa. ix. 5, 6. To the sorely oppressed and plundered people of northern Israel, the people that sit in darkness, Isaiah promises the rise of a great light, the dawn of a new day of hope and joy. They are to see the yoke of Assyria broken, and the conqueror's terrible accoutrements of war burned in the fire.[2] This hope is based on the certainty that a Son of David is given to the people as a Saviour and Redeemer. The prophet here speaks without hesitation of a King about to come. The perfect expresses what has been finally determined in the counsel of God, although for human history it is still future.[3] To the eye of the prophet, indeed, this future is close at hand.

The Deliverer whom Isaiah foretells, "the Son," "the Child,"

[1] Isa. xxviii.–xxxiii. (xxxii. 1, xxxiii. 17). [2] viii. 23 f., ix. 1–4.
[3] Ewald, *Gram.* § 135*c*. The reference to Hezekiah himself (*Rab. Grot. Gesen.*) is therefore inadmissible.

is anything but a God in the metaphysical sense of the word. God gives him to the people, lends him to them for a definite purpose.[1] The jealous love for Israel of the great God, who cannot bear that His own peculiar people should be profaned by strangers, sends him.[2] The purpose of God is that this Child should extend his sway, and make an unending peace, and that, being exalted to the throne of David, he should establish it on righteousness and judgment,—that is, give it true and permanent strength, by making righteousness the foundation of his government.

He is primarily a Child, a Son, as the context shows, of David,[3] on whose shoulders rests "the government," that is, the government in the kingdom of God,[4] a God-given King, who gives the kingdom of Israel new splendour and new power, and, at the same time, the immovable foundation of true righteousness. But this King is an everlasting King.[5] True, the word "everlasting" has, in the Old Testament, anything but a definite signification, and is not infrequently used, especially in connection with human governments, as a hyperbolical expression for long duration.[6] But in this instance, when the final era is being dealt with, in which the natural surroundings are to become as glorious as those of paradise, and after which assuredly no new transformation is expected, there is no reason to doubt that Isaiah really speaks of the Messianic ruler as everlasting. At least it is said that his government, that is to say, the dynasty proceeding from him, is to continue in undisputed possession of the throne to the end.

Consequently, names are ascribed to this king which raise him, in dignity and position, far above all comparison with anything human. They are to be taken just as the name

[1] Isa. ix. 5. [2] ix. 6; cf. Ps. lxix. 10, cxix. 139. [3] Cf. ix. 6.

[4] The definite article denotes sovereignty as such, *i.e.* the Messianic.

[5] ix. 6, מעתה ועד־עולם; cf. Ezek. xxxvii. 25.

[6] *E.g.* Ps. xlv. 7, lxxii. 5, cx. 4; Dan. ii. 4, iii. 9, vi. 6, 21; cf. Ps. lxi. 7 ff.; xxii. 27.

"Elohim" is elsewhere also applied to men, to describe them according to their position and dignity in the kingdom of God.[1] They are here meant to indicate how unique is the glory and dignity God bestows on this King. The names in their connection correspond to the predicate θεός, and exalt the Messiah to the position of "One who reigns and rules in the name and with the dignity of God."

The names are, "Wonderful Counsellor,"[2] *i.e.* incomparable in guiding the destiny of the people; "divine Hero,"[3] *i.e.* a warrior going forth in the strength of God, so that in him the qualities of a true King both in war and peace are found gloriously combined; "Father of Spoil," *i.e.* he who brings his people victory and success in war;[4] "Prince of Peace," *i.e.* he who makes peace not by declining to fight, but by invincible and victorious prowess.[5]

Thus the Messiah appears as the perfect King, who represents in himself the power and greatness of Israel's real King, in whom is present all the glory which the people of

[1] Cf. my essay on Rom. ix. 5 (*Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie*, 1868, 3. 501 ff.).

[2] פלא־יועץ is quite as much a compound title as the double words that follow, "a marvel of a Counsellor" (Gen. xvi. 12; Prov. xxi. 20; Ewald *Gram.* § 287*g*). The הפליא עצה of Isa. xxviii. 29.

[3] אל־גבור quite as naturally of God (x. 21; Deut. x. 17) as of heroes possessed of divine strength Ezek. xxxii. 21 (Zech. xii. 8 f.). Still it could not be used here close to x. 21, if Isaiah were not thinking of the divine strength revealing itself in this Son of Man.

[4] אבי־עד. Formerly I considered this translation too meaningless to be preferred to the other, viz. "Everlasting Father," *i.e.* He who takes care of His people for ever. But, on the one hand, "Father of Spoil" harmonises splendidly with "Prince of Peace," and is on the same plane of dignity. On the other hand, I now doubt whether, considering the way in which אבי is used in Hebrew and Arabic, the phrase could have any other meaning than "the begetter of eternity," or "one to whom eternity belongs as an inalienable attribute," both of which meanings are absolutely unsuitable to the context. Nor is it decisive against this view that אב appears elsewhere as a title of the ruler (Isa. xxii. 21; cf. Job xxix. 16), or that עד as genitive, after words like "mountains," "years," denotes their unchanging duration (Gen. xlix. 26; B. J. xlv. 17, lvii. 15; Hab. iii. 6).

[5] שר־שלום, Micah v. 4. Probably an allusion to Solomon.

God expect in their King, pray for in his behalf, or even ascribe to him in eulogies uttered in moments of inspiration.

We get a beautiful supplement to this passage in Isa. xi. 1–5. Here, too, the appearance of the Messiah is brought into connection with the fall of Assyria.[1] A scion of David's house springs, like a sprout of a noble stock,[2] from the ancient house, after it has, by the miseries of the present and the judgments of the future,[3] been cut down to the root.[4] The fulfilment of Israel's everlasting destiny, and the establishment of a kingdom of peace both among men and in nature, depend on his appearance.[5] But the personal characteristic emphasised in this passage is rather the moral and religious sublimity by which that appearance is distinguished. His divine capacity for the office of King, depicted in chap. ix., is here traced back to its deepest foundation, to the Spirit of God which dwells in this man without measure.

The Spirit of God rests, that is, descends once for all, upon the Messiah; and this Spirit is, according to its effects, described in three double expressions. There is mention not of seven spirits, but of one Spirit, the working of which is manifested in six important ways. This Spirit works in the Messiah (1) as the spirit of wisdom and knowledge,[6] *i.e.* of religious and moral intelligence and of spiritual clearness of perception; (2) as the spirit of a wise and brave ruler;[7] (3) as the spirit of religious knowledge and of pious devotion to God.[8] Thus He is perfect alike as Sage, King, and Saint. Hence He shows Himself the friend of the pious, the righteous Judge. His joy is in the fear of God.[9] This

[1] Isa. x. 33 ff.

[2] חטר, נצר, xi. 1.

[3] As they are foretold in vii. 17 ff., ix. 17 ff., x. 12 ff., 28 ff.

[4] xi. 1 (שרשים, גזע).

[5] xi. 6 ff.

[6] xi. 2 (חכמה ובינה).

[7] xi. 2; cf. ix. 5 f. (עצה וגבורה).

[8] דעת ויראת־יהוה.

[9] הריחו ביראת יהוה, v. 3. Many translate "His breath, the element in which He lives is the fear of God." But here Isaiah is obviously referring

accords with His disposition. He does not, therefore, judge after the outward appearance, according to show and station, which allure the eye, but He allows the very persons who can make no display of any kind, the poor and the oppressed, to share in the benefits of His righteousness. The wicked,[1] on the other hand, He will destroy with this same righteousness, with the rod of His mouth, with the breath of His lips;[2] that is, by His sentence of judgment, which carries with it as an unalterable result death and life.[3] Thus equity and absolute faithfulness[4] will be His equipment for action and conflict.[5] He will be the banner around which all peoples will rally for counsel and guidance;[6] so that the splendour and authority it derives from Him will make the place of His rest, the royal city Jerusalem, beautiful and glorious.[7]

A replica of this prophecy, but from the altered circumstances of the time without such definite personal features, is found in Isa. xxviii. 6, where it is said that, in the last days, God Himself will be to the judges in Israel a spirit of judgment, and to the warriors a spirit of heroic strength. This also explains ver. 16, where "the tried precious Corner-stone of surest foundation," which God will lay in Zion, seems to be not the personal Messiah,—for in that case it would probably have been "he that believeth on Him," not "he that believeth,"—but rather the new Messianic constitution of the state, founded on judgment and righteousness (ver. 17). Whoever

to the effects of this Spirit which has been bestowed on the Messiah, to His manner of ruling. Besides הריח ב denotes "an inhaling with satisfaction," "a sucking in as of sacrificial incense, and therefore satisfaction with somethin coming from without to the person in question" (Lev. xxvi. 31; Amos v. 21).

[1] רשע,—from which later theology has developed the personal Antichrist (2 Thess. ii. 8) is in Isaiah collective, and gives to the word "land," which is in itself indifferent, its nearer definition.

[2] For the further development, cf. Rev. xix. 15.

[3] Prov. xvi. 14, xx. 8; cf. Heb. iv. 10. [4] Ver. 5, צדק and אמונה.

[5] The girdle of His loins, *i.e.* what makes a man ready for marching and fighting, *expeditus* (1 Sam. ii. 4; Ps. xviii. 33, cix. 19).

[6] Ver. 10. The דרשׁ אל reminds one of the phrase for asking oracles.

[7] The מנוחה is Canaan in general and Jerusalem in particular.

waits trustfully for this act of God will weather the storms of the troublous time. But the result will bring to naught the deceitful hopes of the wicked. And Isa. xxxii. 1–8 and xxxiii. 17 are also meant in quite a similar sense, for there it is a question, not of the personal Messiah, but of the kingdom in Israel after the deliverance, which, by its righteousness and renown, is to the people a pledge of a happy time.

The other passages from Isaiah's genuine writings, which are applied to the Messiah, I am unable to regard as rightly interpreted. Of these Isa. iv. 2 is the first to claim attention. This passage undoubtedly speaks of the Messianic age. But "the sprout of the Lord" of whom it speaks cannot be the Messiah, so that He would be described as He whom God causes to sprout forth (sc. for David). The term "sprout," viz. the sprout of David that God causes to grow, is in later times, it is true, not an unusual title of the Messiah.[1] But (1) in every instance where it is so, the word is explained in a way absolutely unambiguous, or else is connected with some idiom already established, but here it would be quite unintelligible; (2) Parallel with this expression stands the other, "the fruit of the land," which cannot in any case be understood of the Messiah; (3) We should have expected a prophecy of the Messiah's coming, not a simple and direct statement of what will happen to Him. As applied to the people, the word could only be understood if the new Zion were contrasted with the returning ten tribes, which is not probable. Most expositors now understand it to mean the blessings of nature. But, on the one hand, the emphasis which is laid on the word appears too strong for this meaning; and, on the other, I do not think the expression in that case sufficiently intelligible. It should be taken as describing the spiritual fruit of the land, the life of those last days which springs from God, and is to be the glory of the Israelites. The people is no longer to delight in the idols and the false civilisation of

[1] Jer. xxiii. 5, xxxiii. 15; cf. Zech. iii. 8, vi. 12.

foreign nations, but is to seek its honour in what God Himself makes to sprout in Israel, and in what the land itself produces, in the national and spiritual possessions of God's people.[1]

In the famous passage, Isa. vii. 14 ff., the child Immanuel, whose birth the prophet contrives to make into a miraculous sign for the unbelieving Ahaz, might with a greater show of truth be taken to mean the Messiah, so that He would be described as "the Son of the virgin." King Ahaz, terrified by the invasion of the allied forces of the Syrians and the Ephraimites, receives from Isaiah the assurance that this attack will do him no harm, and also the offer to confirm this assurance by any sign he may choose to ask. When Ahaz hypocritically declines to ask the sign, letting it be seen that it is not merely from the human prophet but even from God Himself, that he declines to receive instruction,[2] a sign is given him unasked, which is a visible pledge, not only of the promise already made, but likewise of the heavy punishment rendered necessary by his unbelief, and his reliance on the world. This sign in itself need not be anything miraculous. Indeed, it is inherently unlikely that a miracle would be granted to unbelief;[3] and Isaiah, in a similar connection, speaks of the names and persons of his own family circle as "signs and wonders for the people."[4] It should simply be a material pledge of future, that is, of invisible things. It is certain that this sign must be a visible one, which was fulfilled before the eyes of the people, and that, too, before the end of the war then going on. The boy whose name and destiny are to constitute this sign, is represented as a child when Syria and Ephraim are defeated, — as a growing lad when the chastisement by Assyria overtakes Judah.[5] Consequently, it is impossible

[1] Cf. Isa. ii. 6 ff.; Hos. x. 12 f.; B. J. xlv. 8, lxi. 11; Ps. lxxxv. 12; Deut. xviii.

[2] Isa. vii. 13, to weary God.

[3] Matt. xii. 38 ff., xvi. 1 ff.

[4] *E.g.* viii. 3, 18, xx. 3; 2 Kings xix. 29.

[5] Isa. vii. 15, 16, 21, 22.

that the whole prophecy should refer to a remote future, which could not itself be grasped except by faith. A sign is a visible pledge, and cannot possibly be itself such as to require another pledge.[1]

The "virgin,"[2] whose Son is to indicate by His name and lot the destiny of the people, must in any case, at the time of the prophecy, have been already a grown-up woman, no matter whether the prophet pointed to her; or whether the hearers were able to recognise her, from the mere allusion, as a relative of Isaiah himself, or as a virgin of the house of David; or whether the prophet merely spoke of any woman, to whom the specified dates and the various other circumstances might apply. When it is said of her "Behold she is with child, and beareth a son," it is probable, from the ordinary idiom, and from Gen. xvi. 11, a passage obviously used as a parallel, that she should be thought of as already pregnant, so that it is only the birth of the son and his name which belong to the future and constitute the sign. If so, it is self-evident that the name "virgin" is used in the general sense of "young woman." Or the whole phrase may be taken as

[1] One might meet this argument by pointing to Ex. iii. 12 (C) where, as a sign that God had really sent him, Moses is given another prophecy, "that Israel will worship God on Horeb." But, apart from the fact that there a *historian* is speaking, who naturally connects what is later or earlier in a different way from a *prophet*, who speaks from the standpoint of the present, this prophecy does refer to something which Moses himself is to experience,—something, therefore, which may still really give him a sensible pledge of his divine mission. But in the passage in Isaiah, that which was the higher and more remote would be the pledge of that which was the nearer and easier.

[2] העלמה. That the etymological meaning of the word is simply "a woman in the bloom of youth," not, like בתולה, an unmarried woman, is beyond question; cf. the Dictionaries. Still the word is certainly applied, by the usage of the language, to unmarried persons; Gen. xxiv. 43; Ex. ii. 8; Ps. lxviii. 26; Song i. 3, vi. 8. The most doubtful passage is Prov. xxx. 19, where, perhaps, the reference may be to adultery. At any rate, when בתולה itself is used in poetry of a married woman (Joel i. 8; cf. Jud. xvi. 7) there can be no doubt that עלמה may be so used. But when the context does not prove the opposite, the probability is certainly all in favour of an unmarried person being meant.

future, as in Judges xiii. 3, 5, where a wife is similarly described, who has as yet no prospect of bearing a child.[1] In this case the word "virgin" might be taken in the strictest sense, but, if so, since the opposite is not expressly stated, it is perfectly evident that she is meant to bear this child by getting married.[2] So far as the significance of the sign is concerned, the difference between these two interpretations is but slight. By the first the dates are brought a little closer to the utterance of the prophecy than by the second. But in the birth itself and its connection with the word "virgin," there is nothing miraculous, and nothing that is part of the sign. It is solely with the name and the destiny of the child that the sign is connected. All else is mere introductory matter—necessary, no doubt, but without any bearing on the sign itself.

Accordingly, the sign is as follows. The prophet points the people to a young woman before him. This woman is to bear a son; and it matters little whether it is a promise to one, still a virgin, that she will marry and bear a son, or, as is more probable, to one already looking forward to the birth of a child, that it will be a *son*. This son she is to call Immanuel,[3]—as Hagar is ordered to call her son Ishmael,—not as if God was to be in a special sense with the boy, and, least of all, as if the boy were to be a God living with the people; but she is, by the name of the child, to give the people a pledge that God will not desert them.[4] Consequently, it is the name of the child which gives the sign the appearance of being a comforting prophecy. But the way in which this prophecy is to be fulfilled, is vouched for by

[1] Cf. Gen. xx. 3.

[2] Hitzig, "When it is said, a blind man is seeing, it is perfectly evident that the man is, in that case, no longer blind."

[3] עִמָּנוּאֵל, vii. 14; cf. viii. 10.

[4] Hence used quite as a motto, viii. 10. Similarly, Isaiah's children are called Shear-jashub and Maher-shalal-hashbaz. Such is, in fact, generally the meaning of names like Ishmael, Jotham, Joram, Zedekiah, and a hundred others.

what is said about the destiny of the child. By the time[1] he knows how to distinguish good from evil—in other words, when he is a growing lad,[2] he will eat curdled milk and honey—that is, the produce of a land in which wine-growing and husbandry are impossible, a land which has become pastoral and desert.[3] And, even before the infant has become a boy—that is, in a very short time—the land, "before whose two kings Ahaz stands dismayed," viz. Syria and Ephraim, shall be forsaken.

Consequently, in the lot of this boy, the people receive a pledge that the present distress will indeed pass over quickly and lightly,—of which viii. 1–4 is also a sign and pledge,[4]—but that, after that, their pretended friend will cause them times of very sore affliction and national distress. In the name of this child they have the assurance that, beyond all this suffering, there awaits Israel an eternal future of salvation,—for "God is with us."

It is perfectly clear that with this interpretation the view of the early Church, that the prophecy refers to the Messiah being born of a virgin, is irreconcilable. For the meaning is not that the mother is to remain a virgin; nor is it the birth of the child that constitutes the sign, but His name and His lot in life. The child must certainly be thought of as born before the retreat of the Syrians and the Ephraimites.

But, great as is the certainty with which this negative judgment can be given, equally great is the uncertainty which hangs over the more definite, positive interpreta-

[1] ל, cf. Ewald, *Gram.* § 217*b*.

[2] For the phrase, cf. Deut. i. 39; Jonah iv. 11 (*Odyss.* xviii. 227 f., xx. 309), the best parallel of all is 2 Sam. xix. 35, where the reference is to an old man, losing the sense of taste. On the other hand, in 1 Kings iii. 9, the phrase means the capacity for administering justice. The time-limit, as is natural, is not definitely fixed, but is, as such a prophecy requires, elastic. Probably from three to four years may be meant. Still shorter is the interval in viii. 4, when the crisis has come even nearer, "before the boy can cry 'My father! my mother!'"

[3] The proof of this meaning is in vers. 21 and 22 (cf. Job xx. 17; Ex. iii. 17, etc.).

[4] The passage is almost a commentary upon ours; similar, also, is Isa. xxxvii. 30 (2 Kings xix. 29).

tion of this much-discussed passage.[1] Not a few scholars, who are right in all essential points in their interpretation of the historical connection of the passage, have, nevertheless, in a variety of ways, taken Immanuel to mean the Messiah.[2] Isaiah must, in that case, have understood by the "virgin" a daughter of the house of David, and have expected the Messiah to be born in the very midst of the troubles of the impending crisis, to share with His people the miseries of Assyrian rule, and after a terrible battle to break, like a second Gideon, the power of the oppressors. Certainly Isaiah and Micah connected the advent of the Messiah with the overthrow of the Assyrian supremacy.[3] But the fact that Judah is called the land of Immanuel[4] is no proof of Immanuel's royal rank. It is a common enough expression for a man's native land.[5] And nowhere, not even where it would seem most natural,[6] is the royal dignity of this child ever mentioned. Not one of the indisputably Messianic passages in Isaiah makes any reference to the name Immanuel. The bare designation, "the virgin," scarcely seems a suitable one to apply to a lady of royal birth. And that the sign would be connected with the house of a mocking king like Ahaz, who, so far as the giving of the name was concerned, could easily prevent its fulfilment, is hard to

[1] Not merely Nägelsbach's rash exposition, but even Bredenkamp's latest attempt at Messianic interpretation, must leave every unprejudiced reader more strongly convinced than before, of the impossibility of such explanations; cf. Giesebrecht, "Die Immanuel-Weissagung" (*Theol. Stud. u. Krit.* 1888, 2).

[2] Ewald, Bertheau (*Jahrbb. f. deutsche Theol.* iv. 4), Köster, p. 104, Delitzsch, Cheyne.—W. Schultz (über Immanuel, *Stud. u. Krit.* 1861, 4, 713 ff.) combines in a curious way the Messianic interpretation and that which we are to mention next (the family of David, not through a king, but through a virgin, that is to say, when the family is still only a stump. The Messiah, and she who bears Him, are connected with their typical foreshadowings and beginnings down to the time of Ahaz. . . .).

[3] Isa. ix. 11; Micah v. 4 ff.

[4] Isa. viii. 8, even if the word in question is here actually connected with what precedes.

[5] *E.g.* Gen. xii. 1.

[6] So vii. 22.

believe. Hence this interpretation, too, which would, besides, add absolutely nothing to what is said in chapters ix. and xi., is scarcely probable. Immanuel must be a child of the people.

Still more untenable is the view which can be already noticed in Br. Bauer,[1] and which is more fully worked out by v. Hofmann.[2] It takes "the virgin" to mean the whole class of virgins.[3] The emphasis lies on the three things to which prominence is given, as being specially striking—(1) Conception by a virgin; (2) The name God with us; (3) The eating of milk and honey. The sign is intended to indicate that the chosen people will develop out of Israel, not by natural evolution, but in a way as miraculous as it would be for a virgin to conceive and bear. This people will know to choose good rather than evil. But before Israel attains such knowledge, the punishment already due overtakes him. After the most terrible oppression by Assyria, it is to become the land of Immanuel—a chosen people, yet living a life full of privation. It is easy to see how attractive this exposition is. But (1) what we should then have would not be a sign, but a prophecy delivered in the form of a parable; (2) All the striking resemblance to viii. 1–4, 18, must be arbitrarily disregarded; (3) to distinguish between good and evil is for men, as we know them, a pure question of time, as in viii. 4; the point emphasised is certainly not the growth of moral consciousness; (4) There is nowhere in the text any mention of a miraculous birth from one who still remains a virgin; (5) The son of the virgin is to be a pledge to the people of its destiny and its hope; it is, therefore, impossible to interpret the passage so that, in the first instance, the virgin should be the type of the people, and then her son the type of the new penitent people; (6) The whole reference to the Syro-Ephraimitish

[1] Vol. ii. 397, "In the virgin the prophet personifies the pure receptivity of the people.

[2] I. 185 f., ii*b*, 85 ff.

[3] Like *ὁ σπείρων*, Matt. xiii. 3.

war is, on this theory, utterly swept away. The main historical point in the narrative is therefore wholly overlooked.

Now since the statement of the prophet is far too indefinite to warrant our understanding by the Almah a particular person present among the multitude, there are only two attempts at interpretation which appear to me to stand the test of examination. Either the prophet is speaking quite generally, "A young woman (any one you like) who is now expecting the birth of a son will, when she bears him, call him Immanuel, as a sign that the present danger is no longer pressing; and the people will then experience during the lifetime of this child what his lot in life exemplifies." Or else he means his own wife whom, in viii. 3, 18 in quite a similar connection, he sets before the people as a sign. If so, Immanuel would be the younger brother of Shear-jashub and older than Maher-shalal-hashbaz, and the whole narrative would belong to that branch of typology which makes use of the prophet's family history, and of which he says, "Behold, I and the children whom the Lord hath given me are for signs and for wonders in Israel from the Lord of Hosts." In my opinion the latter interpretation is the more probable because it is the more concrete, and because it belongs to the above-mentioned class of symbols. And if it appears strange that the name Almah should be applied to the mother of a boy already able to accompany his father, it must be remembered that a wife of eighteen (and the mother of Shear-jashub need not have been more) could quite well be so described.

Isaiah's contemporary, Micah of Moresheth, also speaks in the most sublime language of the Messianic king.[1] After he

[1] The recent attempts to take the sections in question from Micah, and assign them to a late prophet who imitates him, do not seem to me at all convincing. Were they correct, we should have an artificial repetition of Isaianic thoughts, without the development of the Messianic hope being thereby essentially altered.

has spoken of Israel's distress and deliverance, and of the final overthrow of God's heathen enemies,[1] he continues: "Out of little Bethlehem Ephratah will God arouse Him who is to be Ruler in Israel; whose goings forth are from of old, from ancient days."[2] When she who travaileth hath brought Him forth, the time of Israel's subjection to his enemies, the time of dispersion shall be at an end.[3] And the Messiah shall feed Israel in the strength of the Lord, in the majesty of the name of Jehovah his God; being feared upon earth, so that His flock can dwell in peace.[4] He will be Israel's peace-bringer,[5] who will triumphantly repel Assyria, as soon as she attempts anew to trouble Israel, and will bring her into subjection.[6]

Thus the Messiah is primarily to be a son of David; His family birth-place, the ancient city of David, Bethlehem—small in extent, but great through its importance for the kingdom of God.[7] The words do not necessarily imply that He must be born just in this city, and that the house of David is thought of as no longer ruling in Jerusalem. Bethlehem is named simply as being the original seat of His family, so that He is thereby described as a son of David. Still iii. 12 and iv. 9, 14, make it at any rate probable that Micah thinks of the house of David as completely stripped of its power, and perhaps as living in peaceful obscurity at the old family seat.

The goings forth of the Messiah—that is, the starting-points to which His pedigree leads up—are to be "from of old, from the earliest days."[8] It is impossible for this to mean an

[1] Micah iv. 9 ff. [2] Micah v. 1. [3] Micah v. 2.

[4] Micah v. 3. בעז יהוה בגאון שם יהוה אלהיו.

[5] Micah v. 4. והיה זה שלום.

[6] Micah v. 4 f.

[7] The להיות after צעיר has obviously got into the text owing to the להיות of the following line.

[8] The מוצאות are the various starting-points to which a genealogical table leads up. It is quite absurd to think of different "goings forth," *i.e.* of a gradual coming of the Messiah, as it were, in typical personages.

eternal, superhuman origin, which went along with His earthly Davidic origin as a supplement to it. Against this view the usage of the language is conclusive. For wherever עוֹלָם and קֶדֶם are used by writers of this age in reference to the past, they always denote a mere historical primitive age—for example, the age of Davidic splendour, or of Moses, or of the early prophets, or of the ancient national history in general. It is exactly what we express by "from of old."[1] But, above all, it is refuted by the position which Micah ascribes to the Messiah in relation to God. God is his God. He acts in the strength of God. God's glorious name serves him as ornament and honour. He is a man, a servant of God, as every saint is, only glorified by the favour of God, who allows the splendour of His own majestic name to stream upon him.

The advent of this Messiah is the crisis in Israel's destiny. The "travailing of her who travaileth,"—in which there is no reference at all to any miraculous birth,—is, as it were, the end of the sorrows of the people of God in general. Israel has a sure refuge for all time in the warlike vigour and splendour of this King. "He is peace," that is, He protects from all assault and oppression, even when these proceed from a power like Assyria.

To the picture of the Messiah, as drawn by these two prophets of the Assyrian age, the anonymous author of Zechariah ix.–xi., probably a Judean who had been an eye-witness of the fall of the northern kingdom, adds some significant traits. This prophet, it is true, generally represents God himself as the Redeemer and Ruler of the people, who leads them in battle, so that against the enthusiasm of God's people the devastating waves of the world-power dash themselves in

[1] Especially Micah vii. 14 f., 20; Amos ix. 11; Isa. xix. 11, xxxvii. 26; cf. generally Ps. xxiv. 7, 9, lxxvii. 6, lxxviii. 2, xliv. 2; Job xxii. 15, xxix. 2; Lam. i. 7, ii. 17, v. 21, iii. 6; Gen. vi. 4; Deut. xxxii. 7, xxxiii. 15; Josh. xxiv. 2; 1 Sam. xxvii. 8; Jer. ii. 20, v. 15, vi. 16, xviii. 15 (cf. Graf on this passage), xxx. 20, xlvi. 26; B. J. xlii. 14, xliv. 7, xlv. 21, xlvi. 9 f., li. 9, lviii. 12, lxi. 4, lxiii. 9, 11, 16, lxiv. 3 f.; Mal. iii. 4.

vain.[1] But the Messiah is represented beside Him as a second Solomon, a Prince of Peace. As chariots, horses, and bows are to disappear out of both the kingdoms of Israel,[2] so the King also is "just and saved by God";[3] "lowly," that is, without overweening confidence in his own might,[4] "riding upon an ass,"[5] not as a proud warrior, but in the simplicity of ancient custom, as Israel knew it before they introduced foreign weapons and resorted to the evil practices of war.[6] The kingdom of this new Solomon embraces Canaan in its ideal extent. And he "speaks peace to the heathen,"[7] that is, his word of power commanding peace and making war unnecessary, is to be law to all the nations of the world.

3. This trilogy of Messianic prophecy in the Assyrian period is never again equalled in after days. Never again did the prophets see so clearly the significance of a powerful kingdom as amid the dangers of the Assyrian period, and in view of a figure like that of Hezekiah. True, the picture of a Messianic king is still connected with the hope of complete deliverance. But other figures stand out more prominently. Jeremiah prophesies that the people "will serve David their king whom God will raise up," meaning that a ruler as glorious as David will be raised up by God out of the ancient royal house.[8] Not till day and night cease, will David want a descendant to sit on the throne of Israel.[9] Otherwise there is little of importance said about him. Jeremiah has more interest in the kingdom itself than in the

[1] Zech. ix. 10–16.

[2] Zech. ix. 9 f.

[3] צדיק ונושע supported, *i.e.* protected by God, on account of his righteousness, that is to say, sure of victory (victorious); cf. Deut. xxxiii. 29. In keeping with this is the expression applied to God, צדיק ומושיע; B. J. xlv. 21.

[4] עני in the religious sense.

[5] The mention of two animals is, of course, merely due to the poetic parallelism; in reality only one is meant.

[6] Gen. xlix. 11; Judg. v. 10, x. 4, xii. 14; 2 Sam. xiii. 29, xviii. 9; 1 Kings i. 33 (the horse as the animal used in war, Isa. ii. 7, xxx. 16; Deut. xvii. 16).

[7] Zech. ix. 10. דבר שלום לגוים.

[8] Jer. xxx. 9; cf. xxxiii. 15, 17.

[9] Jer. xxxiii. 17, 20, 22, 26.

personality of an individual king. But this he insists on again and again, that the king will be righteous,[1] a righteous and prudent shoot of David, through whom safety and salvation will come to Israel.[2]

The name "God our Righteousness"[3] is generally regarded as a designation given by Jeremiah to this Davidic king. Were that correct, the name would, of course, say nothing as to the character of the Messiah, or even as to His divinity. The mother who calls her son Zedekiah, Jotham, Joram, Immanuel, or Ishmael does not mean thereby to describe that son as a righteous, gracious, exalted God, or as a God who lives with men and hears them; but she testifies by that name to her own belief that God is righteous, gracious, exalted, etc. In like manner this name of the Messiah would express the belief that God is His people's righteousness, is He who procures justice for them, and is their Helper. But it is not at all certain that this name is applied to the Messiah. According to Jer. xxiii. 6, that would, it is true, be the best explanation of it. But from a comparison of the perfectly similar passage in xxxiii. 15, 16, in which the Messiah is also spoken of, and where nevertheless this same name is applied to the people, as is clear from the suffix being feminine, it seems probable that even in the first passage, in spite of the suffix being masculine, the meaning is: the people, which will, through the advent of the Messiah, be happy and secure, shall be called "God our Righteousness." The old name, Israel, is to give way to this new religious name.[4]

Still more important is what the author of Zech. xii.–xiv., who is evidently a contemporary of Jeremiah, says about the Messiah. According to him, indeed, neither the Davidic king, nor Jerusalem itself, is to have the real honour of

[1] Jer. xxiii. 5, xxxiii. 15, 17. [2] Jer. xxiii. 6.

[3] יהוה צדקנו, xxiii. 6; cf. xxxiii. 15 f.

[4] Of course, this argument would fall to the ground, were the passage, xxxiii. 14–26, not Jeremiah's own, for which certainly many reasons can be adduced.

delivering Judah, lest their arrogance should become too great. The deliverance is effected by the country people of Judea,[1] while as yet the inhabitants of Jerusalem remain quietly within Jerusalem.[2] But when the final struggle begins and the crisis comes, then every one, even the weakest, will show himself a hero, a hero like David,[3] and the house of David shall be at their head as God, as an angel of the Lord;[4] in other words, as God or His angel went of old before the army of Israel at the Exodus, so will the house of David lead the hosts of the holy people. By the explanatory addition, "as an angel of the Lord," this comparison with God is saved from every possibility of metaphysical misconception. It simply refers to the ability of the Davidic king in war, and to his glory as commander-in-chief. And he is not even represented as a person, but simply as a member of his house, of that very house whose pride is censured, and in whose case the necessity of repentance for past misdeeds is presupposed. But, all the same, the dignity of this Messianic house is extolled in an ideal fashion, and to it the name of God is assigned.

In a beautiful supplement it is declared by the same prophet that for the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem there will then be a fountain of reconciliation, so that all ungodliness may be washed away,[5]—that God will pour upon this house of David and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem the spirit of grace and of supplication, so that they may mourn along with the whole people over the murder of the man of God.[6] Thus the glory of the Messiah is based on repentance and reconciliation. He is not represented as exempt from the

[1] Zech. xii. 4–8.

[2] That is the meaning of the sentence, וישבה ירושלם עוד תחתיה בירושלם; Ex. xvi. 29. The usual explanation, "Jerusalem shall remain undestroyed," contradicts the עוד, and is, in the context, pointless and weak.

[3] Zech. xii. 8. [4] כאלהים כמלאך־יהוה לפניהם (cf. Isa. vii. 13).

[5] xiii. 1. In this מקור נפתח we have perhaps the passage to which Jesus referred, when he said that in order "to fulfil all righteousness," the Messiah must submit to John's baptism of repentance.

[6] xii. 10 (רוח חן ותחנונים).

sin of the people, because He is included in the "proud" house of David.

What Ezekiel says of the Messianic king is essentially on the same plane. After the shoot of the vine (Zedekiah) has been torn out, he prophesies that of the cedar, the real old house of David represented by the line of Jehoiakin, God will again plant on the holy mountain a tender twig, so that it will grow into a cedar, under the shadow of which fowl of every wing will lodge.[1] Ezekiel promises that He will come to whom the right belongs—that is, He who practises righteousness, and to whom God entrusts judgment.[2] He declares that in a short time—a time so short that the prophet hopes in consequence thereof to exercise his calling more freely himself—God will raise up a horn for Israel,[3] that He will in the last days set over them "His servant David,"[4] by whom Ezekiel, no more than Jeremiah, understands the historical David, but a shoot of the ancient royal house like unto him. God appoints him Shepherd over the whole flock of Israel, Prince over both the peoples whose God is Jehovah; and, as the new Jerusalem is everlasting, so its King shall reign for evermore.[5]

It is doubtful whether Ezekiel in this last declaration was thinking of the personal immortality of the Messiah, or of the everlasting duration of the dynasty. If the former be the case, he changed his opinion, at any rate, in other and later periods of his prophetic career, and turned his eye away from the personal Messiah to a Messianic dynasty. When he speaks of the rights and duties of "the Prince in Israel," he never has a particular individual in view. Occasionally, indeed, he speaks of "princes" in the plural.[6] The prince has the right to pass through the holy door of the temple, which is otherwise kept shut on working days, and to partake of the

[1] Ezek. xvii. 22 ff. [2] Ezek. xxi. 32 (Eng. 27). [3] Ezek. xxix. 21.
[4] Ezek. xxxiv. 23 ff., xxxvii. 22, 24, 25. [5] Ezek. xxxvii. 25.
[6] Ezek. xlv. 8, 9 (xlviii. 21 ?).

thank-offering before God.[1] His inheritance lies quite close to the sanctuary. He can leave it by law only to his sons. But on this account he must not oppress the people, or appropriate by violence another's inheritance.[2] As the representative of Israel, he must worship in the sanctuary on the Sabbaths and the new moons,[3] and must provide the public sacrifices in the temple. For this he receives a stated income.[4] In short, he has almost the position of a king, who has also priestly dignity.

4. The figure of the Messiah, which is already somewhat shadowy for these last-named prophets, is in the exilic passages of the book of Isaiah put wholly into the background. Everywhere it is God Himself who is represented as being glorified in Israel in His own power and majesty. And really it is Cyrus, the victorious king of Persia, who stands forth as the anointed of God, the Messiah.[5]

The only passage that might be referred to the Davidic king of the future is B. J. lv. 3, 4. When it is said: "I make an everlasting covenant with you, even the sure mercies of David; behold, I have given Him for a witness to the people, for a Prince and Commander to the peoples,"—one might take the perfect as that of fixed resolution, and understand by David, "the David who is to be raised up." But the following verses show that to the people, as such, is promised what was promised of old to David the individual, viz. "sovereign power over the heathen." The historical David is meant simply as a point of comparison for the glory promised to the people. Consequently this passage is in reality a significant proof of how completely the idea of a future Davidic king has given way in this book to that of the suffering servant of Jehovah.[6]

It is different in the community that rebuilt Jerusalem.

[1] Ezek. xliv. 3.
[2] Ezek. xlv. 7, xlviii. 21; cf. xlvi. 16, 18.
[3] Ezek. xlvi. 8.
[4] Ezek. xlv. 9, 16, 17, xlvi. 4.
[5] B. J. xlv. 1.
[6] It is an allusion to Ps. xviii. 44 f. In like manner the people appeals also in Ps. lxxxix. 36 ff., cxxii. 5, to God's covenant with David. (From B. J.

It was led by a son of David, who was, it is true, merely an official of the imperial power, but still in a sort of way a ruler, and one personally, as it appears, well fitted to represent the ancient and venerated royal family. With Zerubbabel the thought of a Messianic king is immediately brought once more to the front.

Haggai saw in this man himself the bringer of the final salvation. He promises to him personally the fulfilment of his wishes and hopes, the favour of God, and independent sovereignty.[1] Zechariah, at least as his book now lies before us, no longer shared this hope.[2] His prophetic eye glances at Zerubbabel and his companions, only to be directed past him to a far more exalted personage. The leaders of that little band are men "of portent,"[3] pledges that God will send His servant "the Sprout,"[4] as, after Jeremiah's example, this prophet, who is learned in the Scriptures, calls the Messiah. The Sprout (of David) will come, and under Him things will sprout; in other words, there will be clear signs of happiness and prosperity.[5] When He comes, then there will be found in Israel the stone on which are engraved (or "directed"?), seven eyes, the symbol of divine intelligence, probably the copestone of the temple, as the object of God's special care.[6] Then

lix. 16–20, lxiii. 1–6, Ewald would actually infer that God, after having in vain sought for a man to help Him to establish this salvation in Israel—that is, for the Messiah—now declares His willingness to do it alone. But certainly all that is meant in lxiii. 3 is that the hopes originally connected with Cyrus and the Persians were beginning to end in disappointment; and, in lix. 16, that the people was morally incapable of undertaking in a spirit of faith the duties which the return from Exile would lay upon it.

[1] Hagg. ii. 22 f. (Zerubbabel is expressly described, after the final judgment of the nations, as the servant of God in whom He delights, and whom He will use as a signet-ring).

[2] The conjecture of Stade that in vi. 13, על־כסאו should be read instead of על־ימינו, so that Zechariah crowned Zerubbabel himself as the Zemach, is at once refuted by the fact that any such symbolical act was impossible under the political circumstances then existing.

[3] Zech. iii. 8.

[4] אישׁ צמח, iii. 8, vi. 12 (Jer. xxiii. 5, xxxiii. 15). [5] vi. 12 יצמח.

[6] Zech. iii. 8 f.; cf. iv. 10. The figure betrays Persian influences.

all the old glory will return; "He will build the temple and enjoy princely honours, and sit and rule upon His throne."[1]

There is still another passage worthy of notice, viz. Zech. vi. 11 ff., where the relations existing between the royal dignity of "the Sprout" and the high priesthood are touched upon. According to the existing text, a crown of consecrated gold[2] is to be placed on the head of Joshua the high priest, but only symbolically, as a pledge of the Messiah's advent; on which account it is then to be preserved in the temple as a sacred memorial. And it is said, "The Messiah will, as prince, build the temple, . . . and a priest will be on his throne; and the council of peace will be between them both. Thus, in the last days, the high priesthood is represented as connected with the Messianic kingdom—not, it is true, in one person, but certainly in the most perfect official unity,—as indeed in the time of the prophet the harmony of these two powers was the condition most indispensable to the success of the new settlement. The full unity of person in the two offices, which would follow from the translation, "And He (the Messiah) will be Priest upon His throne," is made quite impossible by the phrase, "peace between them both." Besides, that would be a threat against Joshua and his house, which in this case cannot possibly be intended. Ewald thinks that the text must be supplemented by "and on the head of Zerubbabel," so that both of the people's representatives, the prince and the priest, would, as types of the future, be adorned with the regalia of power. But, however attractive this suggestion is, it is perfectly certain that it is not only arbitrary as textual criticism, but false in itself. In the then existing circumstances no solemn assembly could have set a crown upon the head of Zerubbabel. A crown is the symbol of independent princely authority. Had the

[1] Zech. vi. 13.

[2] עטרות, according to the text and the fem. sing. in ver. 14, a crown made out of several rings of gold.

Persian governor put on a crown he would have proclaimed himself a rebel, and have inevitably caused the ruin of his whole enterprise. But a priest whose sphere of rule came nowhere into contact with that of the great king could, without scruple, take part in such a symbolical act.

Malachi does not speak, in my opinion, of a human Saviour. For although "the angel of the covenant," who is promised, might, as such, well be, according to the usage of the language in that age, a human ambassador empowered to make a new covenant,[1] so that "the Lord" [2] would be God Himself, and the angel of the covenant the Messiah, still, it is more in accordance with the laws of parallelism to suppose that the two expressions are meant to be synonymous.[3] As in the earliest days God, or the angel of His presence, the angel of the Lord, led Israel, so also, in the last days, God will come, or, what is the same thing, the angel of His covenant.

CHAPTER XXIV.

SUPPLEMENTARY FEATURES OF THE MESSIANIC PICTURE.

1. Considering the unusually great importance of prophecy from the eighth century onwards, it is, at the first glance, strange that in the last days it gives way so completely to the kingdom. Still the explanation is obvious: the future kingdom implies a king. And the last days are to bring about a universal outpouring of the prophetic spirit of God.[4] All are to be taught of God, and are no longer to need instruction.[5] Thus the special function of the prophet ceases to be a necessity. Indeed, the Davidic king himself is represented as permanently filled, in a special manner, with

[1] Mal. iii. 1; cf. ii. 7 (מלאך הברית).
[2] האדון.
[3] Cf. Zech. xii. 8.
[4] Zech. xiii. 2 ff.; Num. xi. 29; Joel iii. 1 ff.
[5] Jer. xxxi. 34.

the Spirit of God,[1] so that he has, as it were, absorbed into himself the figure of the prophet. It may also have contributed to this result, that the deterioration of professional prophecy made it more likely that the prophetic office would cease altogether than that it would, in the last days, acquire special prominence.[2]

Still the figure of the prophet does not disappear from the picture given us of the closing era. And certainly it always becomes prominent whenever the splendour of the kingdom pales, or is regarded with suspicion. It receives special attention in the celebrated passage, Deut. xviii. 15 ff.[3] The prophetic law promises that God will not leave His people in the dark, so that they must needs have recourse to the foolish superstition of heathen soothsaying. God the Lord will raise up to them from among themselves "prophets" like unto Moses. These will, therefore, without superstition and folly, get to know the divine will clearly and fully by the help of the Spirit of God. These the people are to hear. True, I cannot see in this passage a prophecy of a (Messianic) prophet of the last days, nor even a promise of "the ideal prophet, of whom Moses knew that he would culminate in an actual person, Christ." The context and the contrast with heathen soothsaying absolutely require us to understand it of the prophets as a class. God will always "raise up a prophet" at the right time. This is made particularly clear in ver. 20, which presupposes the possibility of a prophet misusing his position, and specifies the means by which to distinguish false prophets from true. Now this is certainly an indirect declaration, that in Israel a class of trustworthy clear-headed prophets, devoted to God, will never cease, and that it is impossible to imagine a perfect Israel without them. Hence, in this passage, there was full justification for Israel, in later times when left without prophets, waiting with

[1] Isa. xi. 2.

[2] Zech. xiii. 4.

[3] For the special literature, cf. Bauer, p. 349.

confidence for the trustworthy prophet, the prophet like unto Moses.

We should have a similar prophecy in Joel ii. 23, if that passage really spoke of a "teacher of righteousness," whom God promises to the people. One might, then, with Merx find in it on account of the article and the לִצְדָקָה, an allusion to the teacher foretold in Isa. xxx. 19, whom Malachi afterwards directly describes as Elijah. But although in itself the word מוֹרֶה may mean a teacher,[1] it is, no doubt, the other signification of the word, viz. "early rain," that is here intended.[2] The word is used in this sense immediately after. It is natural phenomena of which the context speaks; and the result of the Moreh being sent is that the land becomes fruitful. The definite article also tells in favour of this interpretation. Hence the reference here is simply to the needful "early rain in due measure," which is to make good the injury done to the land.

In the second half of Isaiah, chaps. xl.–lxvi., on the contrary, the figure of the prophet is given the utmost prominence, while the picture of the Davidic king becomes quite indistinct. True, even here no individual prophet is primarily meant. Every individual personality is cast completely into the shade by the servant of Jehovah, the prophetic people. But inasmuch as the prophet's own self-consciousness echoes through this general category, this servant becomes a personal being. The prophetic Israel, to the desires of whose soul the prophet himself gives voice, is not only to lead the tribes of Israel to God, but is to become a light to the Gentiles.[3] The Spirit of the Lord is upon him to proclaim liberty to the captives and the acceptable year of the Lord.[4] He is to be God's chief instrument in guiding the destiny of

[1] *E.g.* Isa. ix. 15; 2 Kings xvii. 28; Hab. ii. 18, מורה שקר would in that case be the direct opposite of Joel's expression.

[2] Cf. מורה, גשם in the same verse; Deut. xi. 14, יורה. Also in Ps. lxxxiv. 7 this meaning seems to be indisputable.

[3] B. J. xlix. 6.

[4] B. J. lxi. 1 f.

the world, an arrow kept safe in God's quiver, His messenger to whom He gives the tongue of a disciple.[1] The most active influences at work in the last era are the prophetic office and the prophetic function.

Prophecy, in the person of its great hero Elijah, the forerunner of the last day, has been given by Malachi very special importance as the human means of bringing about that salvation of the future, which God reserves to Himself the right of making a reality.[2] Elijah is to come preaching repentance and producing unity of disposition in Israel. Now this Elijah might quite well be meant as a symbol for a preacher of repentance without any personal reference. But since he is not thought of as in Sheol, but as living and in attendance upon God,[3] it is much more natural to think of an actual return of this great prophet as a salutary means of preparing the people for the last judgment, for the sifting which will take place at the coming of the Lord.

2. In the picture of the final era, the figure of the priest is the least significant of all. In the last days all Israel is to be a nation of priests; and everything in it must be holy. Consequently the thought of special mediators of an official character had already to be kept very much in the background. And in connection with the redemption of the people the greatest prophets attach very little importance to either priesthood or public worship. Still the figure of the priest is not altogether awanting in the final era, and is several times suggestively connected with the picture of the king, as in the priestly figure of a Melchisedek. In the earlier prophets, certainly, we do not find it. But not only does Jeremiah see the Levitical priests offering up their sacrifices in the temple for evermore, as long as day and night return,[4] but according to xxx. 21, he clearly promised the Davidic king himself the right of drawing near to God without dying.

[1] B. J. l. 4, xlix. 2.
[2] Mal. iii. 23.
[3] *E.g.* Ecclus. xlviii. 10.
[4] Jer. xxxiii. 18, 20 ff., 26.

And although it is not improbable that here Jeremiah is, in accordance with his general view, thinking of the king having fellowship with God, just as a prophet has, that is certainly not the case with Ezekiel. In accordance with the whole bent of his nature, Ezekiel makes the Aaronic priesthood a most prominent feature of the time of consummation. In his ideal temple he draws a sharp distinction between the ordinary Levites who, on account of their sins, are to be only attendants and servants in the temple, and the real priests of the family of Zadok.[1] He fixes with great exactness the duties, rights, and incomes of these priests,[2] represents them as teachers of the people,[3] and as judges[4] of high position, so that to bring them gifts brings a blessing upon a house.[5] God is their inheritance.[6] And along with this, as has been shown, he sees the kingdom also in close relation with the sanctuary. The "holy" priestly character is for him by far the most important. For A, Aaron's priesthood is an everlasting ordinance, one therefore in force even during the final era.[7] But it is only in the second Jerusalem that the priest is given the very first place. In Zechariah the high priest Joshua is at least as prominent a figure as Zerubbabel.[8] Although the Messiah is not exactly thought of as taking the high priest's seat Himself, still there is to be between the two of them a fellowship of peace and love, they being, as it were, a second pair of brothers, like Aaron and Moses.[9] Besides, Joshua is represented as a man of "portent," a man who is a sign of the coming of the "Sprout,"[10] so that the offices of king and priest are clearly represented as in close connection in the final era. Malachi sees the purified Levites fulfilling the ancient covenant of peace and life which God had made with Levi, teaching the

[1] Ezek. xliv. 10–15, xliii. 19, xlviii. 11.
[2] Ezek. xliv. 20 ff., 29 f., xlv. 4. [3] Ezek. xliv. 23. [4] Ezek. xliv. 24.
[5] Ezek. xliv. 30. [6] Ezek. xliv. 28.
[7] Ex. xxix. 9, xl. 15. [8] Zech. iii. 1 ff., vi. 11 ff.
[9] Zech. vi. 11 ff. (cf. also the figure in iv. 14).
[10] Zech. iii. 8 f.

people wisely, and spreading abroad a knowledge of God, whereas the priests of his own age are censured.[1] The priests of the final era, as God's messengers, avert guilt from man.[2]

The Davidic kingdom is thus the central figure in the picture of the future. It is only to the figure of the king that the prophets give distinctly personal traits. Prophecy and priesthood stand by to help and to consecrate. And as prophecy on its side finds expression in the God-inspired son of David, in like manner the figure of the king is full of priestly consecration. Hence Ps. cx. solemnly extols the king to whom it is dedicated, as king and priest after the order of Melchisedek.

3. Of all the figures in the Old Testament the deepest and most significant is the suffering servant of Jehovah. We saw how this figure is at first identified with Israel, the people of salvation, and with their sufferings, and how it is then, in consequence of the actual Israel failing to fulfil its vocation, restricted to the prophetic Israel that remains loyal to its God, the Israel out of whose heart and mouth the prophet himself is speaking. This Israel, whose vocation it is to save not only its own people but also the heathen world, suffers in the punishment and death of Israel; yea, it suffers double. And yet it has no share in the people's sin, but suffers in accordance with a mysterious decree of God, whose final object is to save the world. We need only indicate how, from its very significance, this figure necessarily became typical. It necessarily pointed every one who read the Scriptures with real intelligence to a mystery in the ways of God, who reveals His own thoughts of love in the substitutionary sufferings of the best, of those who bring about salvation. Consequently the mournful notes in the Passion Psalms, the noble figures in B. J. xl.-lxvi., and even Job himself had to point the believer of later times, who understands the Scriptures, to such a secret, and thus they became types and actual prophecies.

[1] Mal. ii. 3 f., 6 f., iii. 3 f.; cf. i. 6 ff., ii. 1 ff., 8 ff. [2] Mal. ii. 6 f.

That the figure of the suffering servant of God has this typical significance there can be no doubt. But it is a question whether the prophets of this age were conscious that it was a prophecy. In reply to this question I willingly acquiesce in giving, in a certain sense, a verdict of "not proven." In consequence of the peculiarly mystic character, as well as the obscurity of the chief passages, it can hardly be determined, with absolute certainty, how far it is pure typology, and how far there is already in it a conscious reference to the future, and especially to a single individual person. At all events, what is sure and certain is the typical significance of this figure. To the saints who saw most deeply into the meaning of Scripture at the time of Christ, this picture of the suffering servant of God necessarily disclosed the innermost secret of the divine ways of salvation.

In the closing sections of the exilic Isaiah, we often find the thought clearly presented that, in the last days, the truly pious Israel, which has patiently endured the chastisement of its God, will enter on its glorious vocation as the messenger and instrument of salvation, not only to Israel but to the whole world. But all the while—when the prophet is not speaking in his own person—there is never any allusion to a definite individual personality, and least of all to a future one; and the suffering endured by the servant of God is nowhere represented as having a redemptive and atoning character, as the purchase price of the new glory of God's people. It is not represented as something future, but as something past and present. It is represented rather as an inevitable, premature darkening of the glory which is destined for the true Israel. Anything more than this no expositor can find anywhere, except in the famous passage, B. J. lii. 13–liii. 12.

In its present content this passage is a very peculiar one, and has many striking features; and it is not without reason that many modern expositors have conjectured that it is not an original part of our prophet's work at all, but a fragment

taken by him from an older prophecy. If so, one might very readily see in this servant of Jehovah the figure of an actual martyr, some innocent person executed under Manasseh (Ewald). But even supposing this conjecture were right, the fragment must still have been appropriated and altered by the prophet. For, as we now have it, it certainly cannot refer to any historical personage. What is said of the death, the resurrection, and the final destiny of the servant of Jehovah, does not brook the limitations of a purely historical interpretation. We must, therefore, still ask what meaning the prophet himself attached to this fragment, in connection with his own prophecy in which it has been inserted as an organic part.

In my opinion it cannot refer to the people of Israel as such. One might perhaps take liii. 1 ff., as a speech by the kings of the heathen, who are astonished at the glory of the people they once despised, and who in their astonishment proclaim in enthusiastic words "that which they now hear." Even the עַמִּי of ver. 8 might be taken either as a wrong or as a somewhat rare form of the plural, so that the servant of God would be represented as suffering "for the transgression of the peoples the stroke which was their due." But what is said of His burial does not suit a personified people (ver. 9). And the absolute denial of all guilt on the part of the servant of Jehovah is irreconcilable with what the same prophet says so repeatedly and expressly of Israel's sin.[1]

One might think much more readily of the prophetic Israel, out of whose consciousness the prophet himself speaks. "The world and the people shall then understand His worth and His glory in the eyes of God. The true cause of His sufferings shall then be clear." Indeed, in its individual members, this Israel was in many respects a striking type of what is here depicted. The simile of the lamb that is led to the slaughter is taken from Jeremiah, although with a somewhat different

[1] B. J. xlviii. 1-8, xlvi. 8, 12, l. 1, etc.

application.[1] Without guilt of its own this Israel is involved in the fate of the apostates, is buried with the godless in a strange land. And although the individual members perish, it is sure of eternal life for itself, and is a pledge of the triumphant future in store for Israel and for the true religion. Beyond all doubt, the glance of the seer starts from this prophetic Israel, as embodied in the suffering saints of Israel's times of sore affliction. Still it seems to me that even this theory does not exhaust the full meaning of the passage. The description is so concrete and personally vivid that the theory of a mere collective does not do it justice. At any rate, this collective would be personified in the most vivid manner into an ideal picture of the future. And since, in liii. 1, it is the prophet and the pious in Israel that speak, while in ver. 4 the servant of Jehovah is distinguished from these speakers, as He who has suffered and died for them, one must, in my opinion, see in Him something that can be thought of as objective even to the prophetic Israel of the prophet's own age, and distinguished from it.

True, I willingly acknowledge that my view of this passage has been determined not so much by any particular features in the prophecy as by the general impression which it makes. But I am convinced that one will never do it full justice until one rises above the idea of the people, and particularly of the pious prophetic people, to an ideal picture of the pious Israel of the last days conceived of as a person whose features certainly have been taken from the experience of history. The prophet did not mean to speak of an individual of the future. The figure from which he starts is the actual historical figure of which he has so often spoken. But he is raised above himself. The figure which he beholds is embodied for him in an ideal figure, in which he sees salvation accomplished and all the riddles of the present solved. If it is true anywhere in the history of poetry and prophecy, it is true here

[1] Jer. xi. 19.

that the writer, being full of the Spirit, has said more than he himself meant to say and more than he himself understood.

The suffering servant of God is perfectly free from guilt. He had done no violence, neither was any deceit in His mouth.[1] His suffering was borne voluntarily in patient love. Like a lamb led to the slaughter, he opened not His mouth;[2] He gave His life as a guilt-offering[3]—suffered voluntarily what force was wont to make animal victims suffer in spite of themselves. His suffering is decreed by God to atone for Israel's sins. For the people's sake, it pleased God to bruise Him.[4] It was for Israel's weal that He was chastised.[5] By His wounds the people are healed.[6] The guilt of all who are lost in error, God laid upon Him.[7] The blow which ought to have fallen on the people because of their sin, fell on Him.[8] It was Israel's sicknesses and sorrows that He bore.[9] Hence His suffering was not a sign that God was angry with Him. But in order that Israel might be redeemed, in order that God might receive them back again into His love, the Servant of Jehovah took all their suffering upon Himself. Out of divine compassion He, as an atoning Saviour, endured it all in order to secure the salvation of Israel.

The Servant of Jehovah had to suffer contumely and the

[1] liii. 9.

[2] liii. 7. (In Jeremiah it is merely the figure of one ignorant of his fate.)

[3] liii. 10 (the תשים probably spoken by God, so that the construction is broken off. It certainly does not mean "Surely God will not give up His soul as a guilt-offering—no" . . . (Scholten). The אשם is to be understood in the sense it has, not in the sacrificial law, but in the prophets (2 Sam. xxi. 1 ff.). It is quite synonymous with כפר. And in like manner the "bearing" is not used in the legal but in the moral sense, of the sacrifice of a guiltless one who, by entering into the pains of the guilty, takes away their curse (Ezek. iv. 4, 5). Elsewhere simply of the bearing of what is due to the guilt, either of the person himself or of others (Ezek. xviii. 19, xxiii. 35; Lam. v. 7; Lev. v. 1, 17; Num. v. 31.)

[4] liii. 6. [5] liii. 5 (מוסר שלומנו). [6] liii. 5.

[7] liii. 6.

[8] מפשע עמי נגע למו for the sins of my people (the peoples?), the stroke destined for them.

[9] liii. 4; cf. 12.

death of shame. Like a badly-thriving plant, without form or comeliness,[1] with an appearance betokening superhuman misery,[2] despised by all as one smitten of God and a sinner,[3] —what a lot in life was His! And His death was that of a lamb which is led to the slaughter.[4] From prison and from judgment He was hurried off to a violent death.[5] None of His contemporaries bethought themselves that it was solely on behalf of the people that He bore this suffering.[6] As a malefactor he was buried with malefactors.[7]

Such is the suffering of the Servant of God, and such the true inward cause of this suffering. What Israel suffered among the nations because of its calling unto salvation, what prophetic Israel and its individual members endured because they refused to forsake the people they loved, because they chose disgrace and death that there might remain in Israel a seed of a better future, what meets our eyes in the figure of Job, the suffering friend of God, and what is borne in upon our ears from the Psalms of the persecuted servants of God, is all gathered together here in the ideal figure of the suffering Servant of Jehovah in the epoch of redemption.

Wonderful for the Sufferer, as for the people, is the result of all this suffering. The Sufferer Himself having been miraculously raised from the dead enjoys a long life, and is blessed with many descendants.[8] He is indeed exalted very high,[9] and makes peoples and kings rise from their places in reverential silence.[10] He divides the spoil with the strong—

[1] liii. 2. [2] lii. 14. [3] liii. 4, 12. [4] liii. 7.

[5] liii. 8 (לֻקָּח he was snatched away). [6] liii. 8.

[7] liii. 9 (עָשִׁיר or עֹשְׁקֵי רָע or עֹשְׁקִים תָּוֶךְ.) The simple parallelism of wicked and rich is not permissible, nor is the nearer definition "with the rich by their murders" endurable. The בְּמֹתָיו is probably his "mound" corresponding to קִבְרוֹ, for one must not forget that, in a level country like Chaldea, funeral mounds play a very different rôle from what they do in a rocky land like Canaan (Job xxi. 32.)

[8] liii. 10. [9] lii. 13.

[10] lii. 15 (יַזֶּה, not of sprinkling with the blood of a sacrifice, in which case עַל would be necessary, but "to cause to leap up," a gesture of astonishment and reverence, like "laying the hand upon the mouth."

in other words, He is equal in rank and in power to the great of the earth.[1] Thus His picture grows into that of a King. And for the world He becomes the instrument by which the work of God is successfully accomplished.[2] By His knowledge of God, He makes many righteous.[3] Consequently, after He has died for the sins of the people and presented His soul as an offering for sin,[4] He lives again for the justification of His people.[5] Thus this wonderful figure combines in itself the figure of the Priest who offers Himself up as a sacrifice for the world, the figure of the Prophet who by His knowledge of God brings justification, and the figure of the King who, transfigured and blessed, enjoys the fruit of His sufferings. The glory which Israel expects for itself, the salvation which it hopes to work out for the other nations of the world, the glorification which awaits the true Israel in the last days, and the blissful influences which are to flow from it, are here embodied in an ideal figure. As in the book of Job, the pious sufferer is at last crowned with glory and, by his intercession, atones for the sins of his hostile friends, so the Servant of Jehovah stands before our gaze, in the age of consummation, delivered from suffering and from death.

4. If our exposition is correct, this passage is absolutely unique in the Old Testament. It is certain that Zech. xii. 10 ff. was not intended as a prophecy of the murder of a coming ambassador of God. It describes how God will bestow upon the Messianic people, after it has won a glorious victory, under the leadership of the Messiah, the spirit of grace and of supplication. The people and the Messiah will look upon Him whom they have pierced, and mourn for Him as one mourneth for the loss of an only child, of a first-born.[6] The whole land is to be in universal mourning, and then

[1] liii. 12. [2] liii. 10. [3] liii. 11.
[4] liii. 10, 12. [5] Rom. iv. 25.
[6] The passage is of importance for the history of the Asiatic nature-religions.

there shall be a fountain opened to the Messianic royal house and to the people for sin and for uncleanness.

According to the Massoretic text, it is true, God would say, "And they shall look upon Me whom they have pierced." But that cannot be the meaning of the prophet. For it cannot be a case of pure derision and contempt of God. The same word (דָּקַר) is used, in xiii. 3, of bodily injury, and the mourning could not be compared with that for an only child, or for a first-born, unless the reference were to one actually slain. Nor can one imagine that, if an ambassador of God had been murdered, the prophet would really call that a murder of God. On account of the parallel עָלָיו, I have always thought the simplest thing would be to change אֵלַי into אֵלָיו, although the following אֵת would, in the context, be by no means good syntax. The other ways out of the difficulty, "My heroes[1] see Him whom they have slain," etc., and "They will look, with their faces turned to Me, on Him whom they have pierced," I do not think probable, the first on account of the meaning, the second on account of the construction. Here, at any rate, a historical Servant of God is meant, who fell a sacrifice, not so much to the heathen as to the great in Jerusalem. For the whole way in which the family of David, with its pride, repentance, and expiation,[2] is spoken of, points most naturally to some grievous blood-guiltiness resting on the ruling classes in Judah itself. This murdered One is to be mourned as a Martyr of the closing era, so that the crime perpetrated against Him is to be atoned for by repentance and contrition. But neither the figure nor the death of the Martyr is thought of as future, nor is His doom represented as a condition of salvation. Only it is expected that the wickedness perpetrated against Him will be atoned for in the time of deliverance, which is thought of as very near at hand.

Still less can Zech. xiii. 7 be understood of the death of the Messiah. For the words spoken by God include a

[1] אֵלַי, Job xli. 17 (Hofmann).

[2] Zech. xii. 7, xiii. 1.

punishment of wrath against the Shepherd, who, consequently, though in rank a Shepherd and "Fellow" of God, must in reality be a wicked Shepherd. The words are immediately connected, as Ewald has rightly seen, with xi. 17, and contain a threat of punishment against the wicked, flock-destroying king of Ephraim, to whom in His wrath God hands over the people, after His own pastoral care, exercised through the prophets and ungratefully despised, has proved unsuccessful.

Not until a much later age do we find an echo of this prophecy of the suffering righteous Man—probably due in part to the influence of Plato[1]—in the Wisdom of Solomon, ii. 12 ff. The figure of the righteous Man is personified; and it is said that the multitude of those hostile to God despise Him, taunt Him, and hurry Him off to a shameful death, because He makes Himself the Son of God and is obnoxious to the frivolous, until, having conquered death, He rises in triumph and shames His opponents into silence.

CHAPTER XXV.

MESSIANIC PROPHECY AS DEVELOPED BY THE SCRIBES.

1. Prophecy produced by art begins with the book of Daniel, and gets its final form from the same book. The picture of the future, from which it starts, is Jeremiah's prophecy of the seventy years of Exile. Instead of the glorious fulfilment expected at the end of these seventy years, a state of things had arisen very far indeed from perfect; and this, instead of improving with the centuries, had become always worse and worse. The seer's own generation seemed to have reached the very lowest depth of humiliation. In the holy place there stood a foreign altar, "the abomination of desolation."[2] The religion and the national customs of Israel were treated with

[1] Plato, *Rep.* 2. v.

[2] Cf. 1 Macc. i. 54, vi. 7.

contempt by Antiochus Epiphanes. Consequently the seer had to extend the years of prophecy. As the apocryphal letter of Jeremiah changes the seventy years into seven generations, and the book of Enoch makes them seventy reigns, so Daniel changes the seventy years into seventy year-weeks.[1] From this point of view, the book lets the past defile before the seer in the form of visions, in order to embody it in the final age of blessedness. The contending empires are first represented as a statue. Its head of gold is Nebuchadnezzar; its breast and arms of silver, Belshazzar; its belly and loins of brass, Medo-Persia; its legs of iron, Alexander; and its feet of iron and clay, the rival Greek powers in Egypt and Syria.[2] But, at last, a stone is cut out without hands—in other words, is set in motion by God. It breaks the feet of the statue in pieces, and thus destroys for ever the supremacy of heathendom. It grows to be a rock which fills the whole earth, and becomes the kingdom of the Messiah,[3] an everlasting kingdom which no destruction shall ever menace.

Under another figure, in which, quite in keeping with the freedom of such descriptions, many of the features are different, Daniel sees the world monarchies as four beasts, which come up out of the abyss as beings "from beneath."[4] Their attributes make them recognisable as Chaldea, Media, Persia, and Greece; and in the chapter immediately following, the reference to the struggle between Persia and Greece, to the division of Alexander's empire, and to the wickedness of Antiochus Epiphanes, is so plain that this interpretation is absolutely beyond doubt, especially since chaps. xi. and xii. practically throw off all disguise.[5]

After ten Greek kings, a horn (king), quite insignificant at first, attains to great power by destroying three horns that were before him. This is Antiochus Epiphanes, who speaks

[1] Dan. ix. 2, 24 ff.
[2] Dan. ii. 31 ff. (Hitzig).
[3] Dan. ii. 33 ff., 44.
[4] Dan. vii. 3, 7, 21, 25.
[5] Cf. Dan. viii. 4-6, 20-24.

words of blasphemy against the Most High, who succeeds in conquering the people three and a half years, and who resolves to change the public worship of God and the feast days—in short, the religion of Israel. At last, however, God sets Himself along with His saints for judgment; and before Him there appears in the clouds of heaven, that is, as one having His origin not in the abyss but in heaven, the Representative of the people of the saints, "One like unto a Son of Man." He appears, as is natural, on the earth, where the judgment of the world goes on in His presence. The clouds bear Him, not up, but down. To Him is given dominion for ever and ever, after the kingdom of the Seleucidæ is overthrown and the other heathen kingdoms are rendered harmless.

It is, therefore, certain that the prophecy connects the destruction of Antiochus with the advent of the final era of blessedness, and of the Messianic kingdom of the saints. It is only a question whether, in the last-mentioned picture, the "Son of Man" is meant to denote the king of the empire, viz. the Messiah, or merely the people itself personified. A definite decision can scarcely be reached. Although I do not by any means overlook the weighty reasons which can be adduced in favour of the latter view, *e.g.* the comparison with the world-empires which are represented as beasts, and the non-appearance of a Messiah anywhere else, while the kingdom is given "to the people of the saints,"[1] still, I incline to take the former. The whole way in which the coming of the Son of man is mentioned, the saints in conflict with Antiochus[2] being spoken of in the vision quite differently, seems to me to point to a new, and that too a definite, personality. Besides, the beasts in the vision are not peoples but monarchies, to which, therefore, a new monarchy corresponds. Hence Daniel probably thinks of the Messiah as descending in the last days from heaven where He dwells with God, and revealing Himself in a heavenly form like one of the angel-princes whom the book is else-

[1] Dan. vii. 18, 22, 27. [2] Dan. vii. 25.

where accustomed to describe as "like unto a Son of Man."[1] The passage, therefore, shows how the teaching of the scribes, as might be expected from its nature, made the conception of the Messiah more metaphysical and mystic, so that He had His roots no longer in Israel but in the other world. Still, it must never be overlooked that, perhaps even for Daniel, as well as for his imitators, the doctrine of the pre-existence of souls afforded a simple and natural foundation for this idea.[2]

In addition to this passage, many expositors also refer ix. 25 f. to the Messiah, where Daniel, on the basis of Jeremiah's prophecy of seventy years, calculates the duration of Israel's time of suffering and of redemption. From the stand-point of Christian fulfilment it is very natural for them to do so. For it was possible to find, in this passage, a prophecy of the Messiah's death, and of Jerusalem being laid waste in consequence of it. Now, this chapter belongs to the parts of the book which are by far the most difficult to explain historically. If it is taken for granted that the author's chronology must coincide with that of science, an exact interpretation becomes almost an impossibility. If one explains "the prophecy as to rebuilding Jerusalem," (ix. 2), as is most natural, by Jer. xxv. 1, that is to say, about 606–5 B.C., then the seven year-weeks would certainly reach about as far as Cyrus, who would in that case be the first anointed, who is at the same time prince. But the following sixty-two year-weeks would bring us to about 123 B.C., that is, to a time at which the last year-week of utter destruction under Antiochus, and the deliverance cannot, in any case, begin. Least of all can one, with Wieseler, make up the interval out of seventy years (not year-weeks), and seventy weeks (*i.e.* one year and a-third), or put the first seven year-weeks last, and thus reckon up $62+1+7$, so that the anointed at the end of the seven weeks would be the ideal Messiah. To think of the seven

[1] Dan. viii. 15, x. 5, 16.

[2] Cf. below.

weeks as running parallel with the sixty-two, as Rösch would do, is forbidden by the unity of the number 70. Any other arrangement than $7+62+1=70$ year-weeks is absolutely unnatural. And this can be got into the actual history only by supposing that the "prophecy as to rebuilding Jerusalem," which Daniel meant, must refer to the prophecy of Deutero-Isaiah, that Daniel therefore took this prophet to be Isaiah, and placed his final prophecies in the reign of Manasseh (655 B.C.). If so, the seven year-weeks would end with 606–5 B.C. (Nebuchadnezzar); the sixty-two year-weeks would come down to 172–1 B.C. (the murder of Seleucus Philopator); and the last week, in which the prophet stands, would be reckoned as the week of oppression, which ends in deliverance. But the reference elsewhere to Jeremiah, and the arbitrariness of the starting-point, are against this. Consequently one would, with Reichel, have to regard the seventy weeks as not exactly chronological, but as symbolical, which is, however, contrary to Daniel's mode of reckoning. Or, lastly, one must simply suppose that Daniel had in view a different chronology from ours;[1] that he reckoned the seven year-weeks correctly from 606–5 B.C. to Cyrus the first anointed prince, the second sixty-two wrongly (probably simply according to reigns), from Cyrus to the death of Onias III., who is also, in xi. 22, the prince of the covenant, and who is here called the anointed who is not a prince. From this date onwards Daniel reckons his last week in which the prince, who is not anointed (Antiochus Epiphanes) in alliance with the Græcizing party, destroys the holy city by storming and sacking it, abolishes the sacred customs,[2] and desecrates the temple until the deliverance comes.

The difficulty of this interpretation we have neither con-

[1] Cf. *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.* 1873, ii. 169 ff., where we learn that the Jews in the Crimea have adhered to a chronology from the Assyrian Exile, which differs very considerably from the one usually adopted.

[2] Dan. xi. 21 ff.

cealed nor minimised; perhaps the passage still awaits the right solution. But that this historical method of interpretation, as it is still shown in 1 Macc. i. 54 (Sept. at ver. 26), is on the whole right, as against the Messianic, is not made a whit more doubtful by the uncertainty in which the details of it are involved. For even apart from the fact that the latter would presuppose a magical soothsaying, such as prophecy knows nothing of, and that the chronology even on that view, especially when compared with ix. 2, is, in the highest degree, arbitrary and uncertain,[1] there is a host of details utterly irreconcilable with it. The stopping of the sacrifices is represented in Daniel as the most shameful of acts.[2] Consequently, it is impossible to regard it as an act of the Messiah. The death, without heirs (אַיִן לוֹ) and successors, of the person murdered, can only refer to the extinction of a ruling family. The anointed who is slain can, from the context, be identical with the one who is to come, only on the supposition that he is also identical with the one named before the sixty-two year-weeks. Either they are all three one person, which does not suit even the Messianic interpretation, or there are three persons whose advent and fate mark the great turning-points of the epoch. The anointing of the most holy—that is, the reconsecration of the temple, is represented as the end of the whole epoch. The sixty-two weeks are mentioned as the period during which the holy city was rebuilt, though in troublous times, which evidently means the comparatively undisturbed yet unhappy years of the Persian and Ptolemaic supremacies. The making of sacrifice to cease is clearly not effected "during the first half of the week" (*i.e.* by the death of Jesus), but is thought of as

[1] Hengstenberg's explanation is still the best. He reckons from the edict of Artaxerxes sixty-nine year-weeks to 28 A.D., *i.e.* years three and a-half before the crucifixion of Jesus.

[2] Dan. vii. 25, viii. 11, xi. 31, xii. 11. To understand the book as a whole, one must start from chaps. xi. and xii.

continuing all through this half week, that is, until the temple is reconsecrated. In short, the Messianic interpretation is marked all through by stiffness and contradiction. In this chapter, therefore, we have simply an apocalyptic way of connecting the destruction of Antiochus Epiphanes with the close of Israel's seventy years of exile, and the advent of its age of blessedness.

2. In the Apocrypha of the Old Testament, properly so called, there is scarcely a single allusion to the Messianic age, and none at all to a personal Messiah. Any one, judging from these alone, would come to the conclusion that the features of the Messiah's figure must have grown pale and dim in the age after Daniel, which was wholly taken up with priestly legalism, and that Jesus Himself had revived this Messianic idea, just in consequence of His own consciousness that He was the Son of God. In like manner the Alexandrian bias in Philo indicates absolute indifference to the hope of a Messiah. As Philo's whole system is almost exclusively connected with Moses, his eschatology, too, is based simply on Deut. xxviii. The superhuman figure, which leads Israel to its rest, is the Logos; but certainly he is not thought of as incarnate. And the incidental mention of a future king and commander-in-chief is wholly without religious significance.[1]

Nevertheless I am of opinion that those scholars are wrong who assume that the picture of the Messiah had faded from the memory of Israel in the age immediately before Jesus appeared. Daniel and the apocryphal-books written in imitation of it were certainly much more read in Israel than the other moralising but somewhat insipid books of the Apocrypha. Doubtless the down-trodden people cherished with ever-

[1] J. G. Müller (*Die messianischen Erwartungen des Juden Philo*, Programm. 1870), refers to a future king not merely in *De Præmiis et Poenis*, p. 915, but also in *De Execrationibus*, p. 937. But in the last passage the parallel with the "Angel of God" is so manifest that, according to Philo's whole mode of expression, nothing but a manifestation of the Logos can be meant.

growing ardour the glorious picture of the Davidic King. In the synagogues it was not only Moses but the Prophets that were read; and they could never allow the picture of the Messianic King to grow faint and pale. Indeed, according to the natural law that governs all learning like that of the scribes, we might rather anticipate that the colours would be brightened by the intermixture of supernatural elements.

The Solomonic Psalms, written after the death of Pompey, show a simple but very vivid hope of a Messiah. They know of King Messiah,[1] the sinless saint, whose words are better than fine gold, who will purify and liberate Israel,[2] smite the wicked with the rod of His mouth, and subdue the heathen.[3] As the son of David, He will feed Israel like a shepherd in His kingdom of the elect.[4] Here, it is true, we find no new idea, but certainly also no waning of the prophetic hope. And though the Jewish Sibyl usually speaks of the people of the Jews as such,[5] and, although the "Davidic sprout"[6] is probably Zerubbabel, and the peace-bringing king from the east is Cyrus,[7] she nevertheless hopes for "the Holy Ruler" who will come to His everlasting kingdom as soon as Rome rules in Egypt too.[8] The oldest Targums begin to identify the Logos with the Servant of Jehovah, that is, to prepare the way for combining theological speculation as to the Logos (the ideal man), with the hope of a Redeemer appearing in the form of man.[9] This is still more distinct in the Apocalypses of Enoch and of Ezra. True, the most important passages in the former book, in connection with this question, do not occur in its earliest part, and Ezra brings us down to the end of the first

[1] Ps. xvii. 35 f., 38, 47, xviii. 6, 8.

[2] Ps. xvii. 27–29, 31, 33, 35–37, 40 f., 44, 48.

[3] Ps. xvii. 27, 32, 34, 39, xviii. 8. [4] Ps. xvii. 5, 23, 44, 50, 45, xviii. 6.

[5] B. iii. 217 ff., 702 ff. (in ver. 775, "Son of God" is certainly a Christian addition).

[6] iii. 286. [7] iii. 652. [8] iii. 49.

[9] Targum on Ex. xxiii. 20; Num. ix. 18; Deut. i. 30; Isa. lxiii. 14; Jer. xxxi. 2; cf. Isa. xlii. 1, xlix. 5; Hos. xi. 19.

century after Christ. But I have no doubt that even the later parts of Enoch are pre-Christian, or were written, at any rate, prior to the apostolic literature, and that even the original kernel of Ezra is wholly Jewish, and altogether uninfluenced by Christianity.[1]

According to Enoch the Messiah is the Righteous One, whose chief attribute is righteousness. He reveals all the treasures of that which is hidden, because the Lord of the spirits has chosen Him, because His lot before the Lord of the spirits has, on account of His righteousness, surpassed from all eternity all the other spirits in glory.[2] He is the Elect One,[3] the Son of man,[4] the Anointed, the Son of the woman.[5] Ere the sun was created, His name was named in the presence of the Lord of the Spirits.[6] He is chosen and hidden before the creation of the world; He dwells among the blessed.[7] He appears, therefore, as the ruler and judge of the world,[8] and is worshipped.[9] Perhaps, indeed, the "hidden name" itself, *i.e.* Jehovah, is used as His name.[10] It is only after the liberation and the judgment that He appears as "the white bull" that governs all.[11]

In Ezra the Son of Man fights, as a lion, with the eagle of the Roman empire.[12] With Him comes the bride, the new Jerusalem.[13] This Son of God rules for four hundred years with His own followers.[14] Then He dies; and seven days of a new chaos begin, out of which, after the final judgment, a new world emerges.[15] For the present He is preserved in paradise,

[1] The question as to Ezra iv. would be materially simplified if, even in the revelation of John, we have to suppose a Jewish document revised by a Christian editor. (Cf. *Die Offenbarung Johannis*, eine jüdische Apocalypse in christlicher Bearbeitung, von Eberhard Vischer, Leipzig 1886).

[2] Dillmann's translation, xxxviii. 2, liii. 6, xlvi. 3.

[3] xlv. 3 ff., xlix. 2, li. 3 f., lv. 4.

[4] xlvi. 1, lxii. 9, 14, lxiii. 11, lxix. 26 f., 29. [5] lii. 4, lxv. 5

[6] xlviii. 2 ff.

[7] xlviii. 6, lxii. 6 f.; cf. xlv. 4, lxi. 4.

[8] xlv. 3, xlvi. 5 ff., xlviii. 7 f., xlix. 4, lxi. 8, lxii. 1 ff., 9, lxix. 27 (lv. 9).

[9] xlviii. 5. [10] lxix. 26. [11] xc. 37 ff.

[12] Ezra xi. 37, xiii. 3. [13] Ezra vii. 26 ff., xiii. 35 ff.

[14] Ezra vii. 28, xiii. 37. [15] Ezra vii. 28 ff., 34 ff.

along with Enoch, Ezra, and others.[1] Then He is revealed for judgment, and slays the world-power with the flame that issues forth from His lips.[2] Here, then, the pre-existence of the Messiah, which is but darkly hinted at in Daniel, is quite clearly taken for granted. But it is equally clear that it rests on the foundation of the universal pre-existence of souls. Consequently, its starting-point is not the pre-existence "of the divine" in Christ, but the pre-existence of His soul among the other souls. God chose it from among the rest in order, by means of it, to accomplish His great work. He hides it until the time to reveal it arrives. That which modern philosophy calls the existence of the idea in God, as distinguished from its historical reality, is here conceived as actual bodiless pre-existence, as Origen still conceives it.

3. The scribes, properly so-called, also created an eschatology of their own, by means, however, not of prophecy but of exposition, viz. the secondary meaning of Scripture.[3]

At the first glance, it seems contrary to all the best established principles of exposition, to speak of certain passages having a second meaning. For most assuredly every word in its context, and in the intention of its author, admits of only one interpretation. And this rule is in no way to be tampered with, even by this theory of ours, as to a second meaning. We do not doubt that the writers of the Old Testament put only one meaning into their words, and that this is to be ascertained only by grammatical and historical exposition. We merely assert that various passages, in consequence of the use which congregations of believers, under the guidance of their teachers, made of them, and in con-

[1] Ezra vii. 28, xiii. 26, 51, xiv. 9 (xii. 31 f.)

[2] Ezra xiii. 5, 9, 11, 37. The signs of the last age, Ezra v. 1 ff., vi. 20 ff., ix. 3 ff., xiii. 29, and the distinction between the αἰων οὗτος which is appointed for the many who are created (Ezra viii. 1, 3), and the αἰων μέλλων which is appointed for the few who are chosen (Ezra vii. 12, 13, 31), point directly to the early Christian view.

[3] Cf. my article on "The Double Meaning of Scripture" (*Theol. Stud. u. Krit.* 1861, 1).

sequence of the thoughts which they, from their own point of view necessarily connected with them, have acquired *in the consciousness of the people a wider meaning* than they at first had. And we think that this meaning, having become historical, contributed of necessity to the development of Old Testament religion, and was of great significance for the picture of the future with which the people familiarised themselves.

No one who looks with unprejudiced eyes at such Psalms as ii., cx., lxxii., can doubt that originally these cannot possibly have referred to anything but the circumstances of the time in which they arose. The singers announce to a king of their own day their wishes, promises, and vows. Upon his head they lay those grand ideal hopes which belong, in a peculiar sense, to the kingdom of this people, and with perfect right, since every king of Israel, for the time being, personifies and represents the kingdom of Israel in its great ideals and hopes. But it is in the nature of such songs to say all this in a higher and more exalted strain than would be either proper or permissible in ordinary prose.

Now, as soon as such songs came to be used in the public worship of God, and that, too, among a people absolutely ignorant of grammatical and historical exposition, and whose knowledge of the Scriptures followed quite different laws—when these were reverently used as the holy oracles of God, to which, from the very first, men were fond of giving a miraculous mysterious meaning, in keeping with their importance—then this people could no longer believe that the kings, of whom these songs spoke, were nothing more than those long since departed kings to whom they were formerly addressed. As these had long ago been stripped by death of kingly glory, the Psalms no longer suited them. As little could Israel, in times when there was no actual kingdom capable of being idealised, apply these Psalms to any living prince. None could be thought of as the subject of such songs but one, the

King who was to unite in His own person all the grand thoughts ever entertained regarding the kingdom in Israel, the Messiah for whom the people were waiting in hope, and on whom the scribes were continually musing. Thus, in consequence of their contents and the actual conditions of their interpretation, these Psalms necessarily became Messianic. They were accepted as prophecies regarding the Redeemer. It was not the authors of the Psalms that prophesied of Him. The first historical meaning of these Psalms refers to Him at the most in a typical sort of way. But from the way in which the believing people applied, and necessarily applied, these Psalms, it prophesied through them of the Messiah. The secondary meaning of these Psalms, which grew up historically among the people, is Messianic.[1] Such Psalms, therefore, as dealt with a king of their own day, but so as to ascribe to him the ideal Messianic thoughts connected with the kingdom in Israel, came to be Psalms in honour of the Messianic King: Ps. ii. (xlv.), lxxii., cx. (xx., xxi.). And on the same principle, when Psalms treated of a saint of the then present, and of his joys and sorrows, but in such a way that men's hopes of the age of consummation were associated with him, that his piety was represented as a victory over death, and his relation to God set in an ideal light, or that the hope of the world becoming perfect, and of the heathen being converted, was connected with his sufferings and his victory over them—then all such Psalms became of necessity Messianic. We see this in the case of Ps. viii. and xvi.;[2] and if this was not so generally admitted in regard to Ps. xxii. (or lxix.), it

[1] Hegel, *Relig.-Phil.* ii. 265. It has been proved that several quotations by Christ from the Old Testament are wrong, in this respect, that the inference drawn from them is not founded on the direct meaning of the words. . . . It is plain from this that the congregation as such deduces this doctrine, in other words, that the inference is due, not to the words of the Bible, but to the congregation.

[2] Naturally many details contributed, in a variety of ways, to this result—details which were understood in the fashion then in vogue with the scribes, *e.g.* the "Son of Man" (Ps. viii., etc.).

was simply because the necessary progress of development was prevented by the natural preference of the people for the picture of a glorious and powerful future ruler, and by their placing in the background the nobler picture of the suffering saint. It was, therefore, solely due to the hardness of the people's heart; and this want Christianity hastened to supply. In like manner there grew up a Messianic interpretation of several of the more difficult passages in the prophets, such as Isa. vii., Hos. vi., xi., etc. In all these cases the eschatology is due to the teaching of the scribes. We have before us an expectation regarding the future, based no longer on the religious assurance of the individual author as to the development of God's thoughts regarding Israel, but on a definite mode of interpreting the sacred words of Scripture.

Along such lines, it is true, no really new element could be introduced into eschatology, just as a mere knowledge of Scripture is never able to contribute anything new to religion. For the "Messianic" import of these Psalms was in fact entirely due to the already existing ideals which prophecy had fashioned. Nevertheless, this secondary sense of Scripture worked out the details of this picture of the future in a great variety of ways. The song, as such, is fond of hyperbolical expressions; and when an anxious and prosaic scribe, full of holy reverence for the letter, treats these expressions dogmatically, the picture transcends the human. Poetry is fond of rare expressions; and these, too, if half understood, seem to a later age mysterious hints. The tendency to a metaphysical exaltation of the Messiah's figure, natural to a discontented age of Epigoni, necessarily received special stimulus from such songs and obscure prophetic utterances.

Thus, from the frequent poetic use of the word "everlasting," the reign of the Messiah came to be regarded, even more than in the Prophets, as an "everlasting" reign, free from all limitations of time.[1] Thus, too, the predicate "God,"

[1] Ps. lxxii. 17, cx. 4.

was applied to the Messiah in a sense quite different from what it had when predicated of an ancient king.[1] The conception involved in the expression "Son of God," "the begotten of God," was given a much more mystic signification.[2] The Messiah was thought of as sitting at the right hand of God, sharing in the honour of His sovereignty,[3] a royal Priest after the order of Melchisedek.[4] His marriage with the Church might be already found in a mystic sense in the Old Testament.[5] His resurrection,[6] and His being born of a virgin,[7] could be taught as dogmas. To Him was ascribed the rule over all things after He had been made "for a little while" lower than the angels.[8]

Thus this secondary meaning of Scripture gave the picture of Christ a much more vivid and popular character, and at the same time contributed largely to the superhuman and metaphysical view of His exaltation and glorification. And it is just to this part of prophecy that the Christian Church has turned with special delight, in order to discover there predictions of her Lord's sufferings, and of the glory that should follow.

[1] Ps. xlv. 7.
[2] Ps. ii. 7.
[3] Ps. cx. 1 (1 Kings ii. 19).
[4] Ps. cx. 4.
[5] Ps. xlv., perhaps also in the allegorical interpretation of the Song of Songs.
[6] B. J. liii. 12; Ps. xvi. 10; Hos. vi. 2.
[7] Isa. vii. 14.
[8] Ps. viii. 6.

INDEX OF SUBJECTS.

A.

A, SYMBOL, i. 64.
Abib, i. 363.
Abraham, i. 94, 97, 108.
Accadian, i. 101.
Accommodation, i. 13.
Adler, i. 367.
Adonai, ii. 129.
Adultery, ii. 51.
Advent of God, ii. 354 ff.
Alexandrians, i. 425, 433.
Allegory, i. 421.
Altar consecration, i. 401.
Anger of God, i. 187, 388, 393; ii. 5, 174 ff.
Anthropomorphism, i. 185; ii. 103, 107, 143.
Anthropopathy, ii. 108–110.
Antichrist, ii. 374.
Antiochus Epiphanes, ii. 440.
Apocalyptic, i. 421.
Archæology, i. 9.
Ark, i. 306, 357; ii. 87 ff.
Aryan religion, i. 45, 46.
Ascarah, i. 374.
Asham, ii. 307.
Asherah, i. 207, 210.
Assyrians, i. 69, 220 ff.
Atheism, ii. 102.
Atonement, conditions of, ii. 99 f.
  consciousness of, ii. 99 f.
  day of, i. 367.
  grounds of, ii. 92 ff.
  limits of, ii. 291.
Autenrieth, i. 12.
Azazel, i. 403 ff.; ii. 271.

B.

B, SYMBOL, i. 64.
B. J. symbol, i. 75.
Baal, i. 148.
Babylon, i. 106, 107.
Bachmann, i. 6.
Bæthgen, ii. 128.
Balaam, ii. 349 f.
Ban, i. 390; ii. 87.
v. Baudissin, i. 178, 179, 424; ii. 135.
Bauer, Bruno, i. 39.
Bauer, Lorenz, i. 82.
Baumgarten-Crusius, i. 1, 3, 34, 84; ii. 278.
Baur, i. 40; ii. 292.
Belial, ii. 281.
Benjamin, i. 28.
Bertheau, i. 291.
Bethel, i. 120, 208.
Biblical Theology, meaning of, i. 1 ff., 10 ff.
Billroth, i. 41.
Blessedness, ii. 65 ff.
Blessing of Jacob, ii. 335 ff.
  of Noah, ii. 346 ff.
Blood, i. 374, 379, 380, 383, 385, 393 ff.; ii. 6, 50, 247.
Blood-avenging, i. 92; ii. 50.
Böhme, i. 1; ii. 18.
Braniss, i. 42.
Budde, i. 30; ii. 315.
Buddhism, i. 50.
Burnt-offering, i. 189, 375, 386 f.

C.

C, SYMBOL, i. 67.
Candlestick, i. 355.
Ceremonial Law, i. 188; ii. 65 ff.
Chaldeans, i. 69, 329.
Chaos, ii. 189.
Chastisement, ii. 87 ff., 212, 292 ff.
Cherubim, i. 185, 352, 354; ii. 229 ff.
Child-bearing, ii. 70.
Christianity, Old Testament, i. 51–60.
Chronicles, i. 77, 202, 209; ii. 18, 278.
Circumcision, i. 192 ff.; ii. 7, 70.
Cities of refuge, ii. 88.
v. Cölln, i. 3, 83.
Coming of God (Advent), ii. 354 ff.
Conscience, ii. 248.

Consciousness of sin, ii. 43, 306 ff.
Covenant, i. 353; ii. 1 ff.
  blood of, i. 196; ii. 91.
  love, ii. 90.
  make a, ii. 2.
  new, ii. 366 f.
  sign of, ii. 6.
  supper, i. 196.
Cover, i. 385 f., 397 ff.
Covetousness, ii. 52.
Creation, ii. 180 ff.
Creationism, ii. 182, 190.
Cruelty, i. 218.
Cyrus, i. 288, 324.

D.

Daniel, i. 291, 407, 432.
David, i. 153, 166; ii. 341 ff.
Day of God, ii. 356 ff.
Dead, i. 346; ii. 71 ff.
  worship of, i. 123 ff., 162; ii. 73.
Death, ii. 254, 313 ff.
Debauchery, i. 217.
Deborah, i. 148, 239.
Decalogue, i. 210, 219; ii. 47 ff.
Delitzsch, i. 382.
Demons, ii. 271, 280.
Deserts, ii. 34 f.
Deuteronomy, i. 71, 302.
Diaspora, i. 334, 423.
Diestel, i. 80, 291; ii. 169.
Dispersion, i. 334, 423.
Doubt, ii. 206, 213.
Dozy, i. 275.
Dream, i. 186, 276 ff., 285.
Drunkenness, i. 214, 217.
Duhm, i. 84, 156, 221, 261, 306, 308; ii. 16, 292.

E.

Ecstasy, i. 254, 274 ff.
Egypt, i. 128.
El, ii. 128 f.
Elijah, i. 241, 242, 297.
Elisha, i. 241, 243, 297.
Elohim, i. 121, 169, 185; ii. 126, 215 ff.
Elyon, ii. 129.
Enemy, hatred of, ii. 61 f.
  love of, ii. 60 f.
Enoch, book of, i. 413; ii. 395, ii. 445.
Ephod, i. 149, 212, 284.
Ephraim, i. 147, 157.
Epigoni, i. 327, 331 ff.
Essenes, i. 410, 433; ii. 398.
Esther, i. 78; ii. 19.
Eternity, ii. 142, 147.
Eudæmonism, ii. 65.
Evil, ii. 269 ff., 318.
Ewald, i. 8, 84, 98, 126, 127, 265, and often.
Exile, i. 224.
Existence of God, ii. 100 ff.
Ezekiel, i. 322.

F.

Face of God, ii. 143, 220.
Faith, ii. 31 ff., 98.
Faithfulness, i. 215; ii. 156.
Fall, ii. 299 ff.
Fasts, i. 372, 402, 431.
Fat, i. 379.
Father, God the, ii. 138.
Fathers of Israel, ii. 6, 91.
Favour, i. 176; ii. 90.
Fear of God, i. 187.
Feasts, i. 189, 202 ff., 359 ff.
Feuerbach, i. 37.
First-born, ii. 10.
Firstling, i. 189, 202 f.; ii. 10.
Flesh, i. 399; ii. 112, 242 ff., 300 f., 314 f.
  eating of, i. 356, 375; ii. 76.
Folly, ii. 284.
Food, laws of, i. 190; ii. 75 ff.
Foreign elements, i. 437 f.
Foreigners, i. 144; ii. 18, 60 ff.
Freedom, ii. 197.

G.

Gabler, i. 80.
Gad, i. 114.
Gazer, i. 268.
Geffken, ii. 177.
Gehenna, ii. 376.
Generation, ii. 70.
Gesenius, i. 382.
Gnostics, i. 33.
God, ii. 79 ff., 100 ff.
  Being of, ii. 100 ff.
  glory of, ii. 168 ff.
  names of, i, 102, ii. 116, 122 ff.
  people of, ii. 365.
  Servant of, i. 267, 301, 310 ff; ii. 96.
  Son of, ii. 9, 115, 342.
  to see, ii. 81, 121 f.
de Goeje, i. 227.
Goodness, i. 215.
Grace, ii. 90, 178 f.
Grau, i. 98.
Guilt, ii. 306 ff.

H.

Hananiah, i. 308.
Hand, filling of, i. 198.
Hand, laying on of, i. 391.
Haran, i. 98.
Hardening of heart, i. 293; ii. 205, 207.
Haughtiness, ii. 286, 373.
Hävernick, i. 84.
Heart, ii. 248.
Heathen, ii. 297, 373 ff.
  Conversion of, ii. 376 ff.
Hebrews, i. 99, 110.
Hedjaz, i. 98, 101.
Hegel, i. 38.
Hell, ii. 375 f.
Hellenists, i. 412.
Hengstenberg, i. 290; ii. 442.
Herder, i. 80.
Hereditary guilt, ii. 244, 297 ff.
Hezekiah, i. 230 ff.
High places, i. 121, 206 ff.
High Priest, i. 334,
Hitzig, i. 101, 417; ii. 267, 300, etc.
Hoekstra, i. 319.
Hoffmann, i. 265, 276, 279.
v. Hofmann, i. 57; ii. 323.
Holiness, ii. 368 f.
Holiness of God, i. 400; ii. 131, 166 ff., 196.
Holy, i. 375; ii. 227.
  of Holies, i. 351 ff.
  Place, i. 205 ff.; ii. 368 f.
Hope, i. 325; ii. 36.
Hosts, ii. 140.
Huldah, i. 246, 345 f., 411 f.
Humanisation, ii. 104.
Humanity, ii. 376.
Hyssop, i. 372.

I.

Idolatry, i. 145, 160, 178, 222, 291, 303, 324; ii. 12, 286.
Idols, i. 207; ii. 257.
  Sons of the Gods, i. 184; ii. 217.
Image of God, i. 209; ii. 257.
Images of God, i. 149 f.; ii. 48, 112.
Immanuel, ii. 408 ff.
Immorality, ii. 287.
Immortality, ii. 82 f., 260 f., 264 ff., 326 ff.
Immutability, ii. 147.
Impurity, ii. 285.
Incense, i. 190, 356, 373 f.
Incest, i. 302.
Inheritance, ii. 8.
Insanity, i. 254.
Inspiration, i. 420; ii. 204.
Intercession, i. 268; ii. 227.

J.

Jahve, ii. 131 ff.
  Zidkenu, ii. 418.
Jealousy, ii. 173 f., 177.
Jehoiachin, i. 305.
Jehu, i. 159.
Jephthah, i. 114.
Jeremiah, i. 75, 249, 267, 308, 318.
Jerubbaal, i. 148.
Jerusalem, i. 154 ff., 306 ff., 325 ff.; ii. 39.
  New, ii. 328, 371 f.
Jeshurun, ii. 29.
Jews, i. 331.
Joel, i. 70, 297.
Jonah, i. 75.
Joshua, i. 141, 326.
Josiah, i. 302.
Jubilee, i. 362 f.
Judges, i. 143.
Judith, ii. 21, 45.

K.

Kaiser, i. 13, 83.
Kalil, i. 376.
Kant, i. 35.
Keil, i. 393.
King, i. 163 ff.; ii. 418 f.
Kingdom of God, ii. 7, 197 ff., 354 ff.
Knowledge of God, ii. 118 ff.
Kohen, i. 343.
König, i. 240.
Köppen, i. 42.
Kosters, i. 330; ii. 215, 217, 232.
Kuenen, i. 84, 138, 159, 178, 265, etc.

L.

Land, i. 122, 135, 265.
Lane, i. 275.
Lassen, i. 98.
Law, i. 176, 188, 321, 328, 333 f.; ii. 37, 80, 84.
Leaven, i. 365 f., 374.
Legend, i. 18, 185.
Leo, i. 98.
Leprosy, ii. 73.
Lessing, i. 181.
Levi, i. 145, 149, 197, 328.
Levites, i. 337 ff.

Life, ii. 82 f., 316 ff.
God of, ii. 112, 130.
Tree of, ii. 261.
Lisch, ii. 231.
Logos, ii. 165 ff.
Lot, i. 284.
Lotze, i. 42.
Love of God, i. 187; ii. 157 ff.
to God, ii. 12.
Lustrations, i. 187, 372.
Lutz, i. 3, 84; ii. 25.
Lying, ii. 284.

M.

Maccabees, ii. Book of, ii. 394.
Madmen, i. 254, 276.
Madness (ecstatic), i. 254, 275.
Malach, ii. 218 ff.
Malachi, ii. 19.
Man, ii. 241 ff.
Son of, ii. 439 f.
Manasseh, i. 233.
Manna, ii. 216.
Marriage, i. 215; ii. 51, 260, 263.
Matter, ii. 185.
Mazzebah, i. 210.
Mazzoth, i. 366.
Mechonah, ii. 233.
Mediator, ii. 91 f.
Menken, ii. 168.
Merits, ii. 34 f.
Messiah, ii. 337 ff., 399 ff.
Messianic hope i. 168 f., 223, 230, 321 ff.
kingdom, ii. 369 f.
Micah, i. 70.
Miracle, i. 297 ff.; ii. 115, 145, 192 ff.
Moloch, i. 233 f.
Monolatry, i. 178.
Monotheism, i. 34 f., 101, 175 f., 226 ff., 276.
Moral Law, i. 219 ff.
Morality, i. 147 ff., 213 ff.; ii. 52 ff.
Moses, i. 125 ff., 164.
Work of, i. 63, 131 ff.
Müller, J. G., ii. 443.
Max, i. 23, 98.
Murder, ii. 88.
Music, i. 243.
Mutilation, ii. 74.
Myth, i. 17 ff., 113 ff., 185.

N.

Nabi, i. 240 ff., 264 f.
Name (new), ii. 368.
Nature, order of, ii. 180 ff., 191 ff.
Nature religions, i. 42 ff.
sympathy with, i. 58 f.; ii. 74.
Nazirite, i. 161 ff., 401.
Necromancy, i. 253.
Nehemiah, i. 331.
Nehushtan, i. 93, 150.
Nethinim, i. 343.
New moon, i. 204, 244.
New year, i. 363, 368.
Nisan, i. 363.
Nob, i. 212.

O.

Oath, ii. 70.
Obadiah, i. 71.
Obed-Edom, i. 114.
Oehler, i. 81, 85, and often.
Offering, i. 373 ff.
Omnipotence, ii. 151.
Omnipresence, ii. 149.
Omniscience, ii. 149.
Oracle, i. 212.
(Massa), i. 266.
Ordinances, i. 329.
Original sin, ii. 292 ff.

P.

Parable, i. 276 f.
Particularism, i. 177 ff.; ii. 13 ff.
Passover, i. 197, 203, 363 ff.
Patriarchal age, i. 60, 86 ff.
prophecies, ii. 347.
Patriarchs, ii. 6, 91.
Pentateuch, i. 64, 72.
Pentecost, i. 366 f.
Persian influences, i. 329.
period, i. 69.
religion, i. 47 ff.
Personality, i. 306.
of God, ii. 100 ff.
Pharisees, i. 409, 433; ii. 396.
Philo, ii. 443.
Philosophy, ii. 83.
Pietism, i. 1, 328.
Poverty, i. 58.
Prayer, i. 371 f.
Pre-existence, ii. 250 ff.
of Christ, ii. 440, 446.
Presence of God, i. 353 ff.
Preservation, ii. 189 f.
Priestly consecration, i. 399.
Priests, i. 186, 190 f., 197 ff., 222, 307 ff.; ii. 10, 93, 427.
Primeval condition, ii. 258 f.
Prophets, i. 151 ff. 186, 221 ff., 235–300, 412; ii. 424 ff.

Prophets, calling of, i. 250 ff.
duties of, i. 266 ff.
false, i. 232 ff., 307.
names of, i. 264 ff.
persecutions of, i. 270 f.
religion of, i. 228, 243 ff.
schools of, i. 240 ff.
speech of, i. 272 ff.
writings of, i. 280.
Proselytes, i. 425.
Protevangelium, ii. 343.
Proverbs, i. 279.
Providence, ii. 191 ff.
belief in, ii. 200 ff.
Psalms, i. 71, 74, 429, 435 ; ii. 393.
of ascent, i. 328.
Solomonic, ii. 444.
Pure, ii. 168.
Purifications, i. 187 f., 372 f.; ii. 60.

Q.

Qoheleth, i. 78, 432.
Qorban, i. 374.

R.

Rainbow, ii. 6.
Ransom, i. 389, 392.
Rapture, i. 254, 274 ff.
Rechabites, i. 91, 159, 163.
Reconciliation, i. 306, 357 ; ii. 87 ff.
conditions of, ii. 99 f.
consciousness of, ii. 99 f.
grounds of, ii. 92 ff.
limits of, ii. 291.
Redemption, ii. 29, 361.
Reichel, ii. 441.
Religious community, i. 326 ff.
instruction, i. 174 ff.
Renan, i. 37, 97.
Repentance, ii. 96.
of God, ii. 109.
Rephaim, ii. 326.
Restoration of Israel, ii. 363.
Resurrection, i. 330 ; ii. 320 ff., 329 ff.
of individuals, ii. 384 ff.
of Israel, ii. 382 ff.
Retribution, ii. 198, 207.
Revelation, i. 109, 182 f.; ii. 118 f., 223 ff.
Riehm, i. 25, 274, 290, 382, 396 ; ii. 230.
Righteousness, ii. 22 ff., 367 ff.
of the Law, ii. 38 ff.
Rink, i. 382.
Rock, i. 240, 264.
Röntsch, i. 98.
Rösch, ii. 441.
Rust, i. 40.
Ruth, i. 75 ; ii. 18.

S

Sabbath, i. 204 f., 244, 326, 360 ff.; ii. 6, 49.
Sabbatical year, i. 336.
Sacrifice, i. 92, 188 ff., 376 ff.; ii. 87.
cycle of, i. 400 ff.
human, i. 191 f., 385 f., 394.
law of, i. 188 ff.; ii. 87 ff.
Sadducees, i. 410, 433 ; ii. 399.
Salt, i. 374; ii. 3, 72.
Samaritan, i. 327, 331 ; ii. 17.
Samson, i. 114.
Samuel, i. 151 ff., 239, 244.
Sanctuary, i. 205 ff.; ii. 369 ff.
Satan, i. 330 ; ii. 275 ff.
Satyrs, ii. 271.
Saul, i. 153, 166, 239, 242.
Scepticism, ii. 213.
Schelling, i. 40 f.
Schleiermacher, i. 33, 282.
Schmidt, i. 81.
Schrader, i. 90, 326 ; ii. 185.
Scoffing, ii. 284, 290.
Scribe, i. 331, 413 ff.
Scripture, i. 328 f., 406 ff., 418 ff.
double sense of, ii. 446 ff.
Sects, i. 432 ff.
Seer, i. 268.
Seineke, i. 319.
Self-righteousness, i. 328 f.
Semites, i. 44 f., 97 ff.
Semler, i. 33, 80.
Seraphim, i. 185 ; ii. 238.
Serpent, i. 231 ; ii. 272 ff.
seed of, ii. 343 ff.
Serving-woman, i. 342.
Shaddai, ii. 130.
Shamelessness, ii. 290 f.
Shechem, i. 145.
Shem, ii. 346 ff.
Sheol, ii. 321 ff.
Shepherds, i. 269.
Shewbread, i. 213, 355.
Shiloh, i. 147, 212 f.; ii. 337 ff.
Shoot, ii. 420.
Sibyl, ii. 444.
Sickness, ii. 73.
Sign, i. 185 ff., 276 f., 298 f.; ii. 195 ff.
Sin, ii. 281 ff.
consciousness of, ii. 43, 306 ff.
universality of, ii. 292 ff.
Sinai, i. 121, 128, 130, 185, 207.
Sinlessness, ii. 24, 292.
Sin-offering, i. 380.

Slavery, ii. 11.
Smend, i. 206.
Smith, Robertson, i. 102, 386.
Solomon, i. 154 ff.
Soothsaying, i. 250 ff., 281 ff., 283 ff.
Soul, ii. 246 ff.
Spencer, i. 33, 284.
Spirit of God, ii. 180 ff., 189 ff., 202 ff., 218 ff., 270, 405 f.
  Holy, ii. 111, 121.
Spirituality, ii. 110 ff.
Sprout, ii. 422.
Stade, i. 9, 122, 178, 194; ii. 134, 326, 327.
Star-worship, ii. 217, 227 ff.
Statutes, ii. 64.
Stein, i. 81.
Steinthal, i. 98.
Steudel, i. 84, 131.
Stone-worship, i. 120, 207 ff.
Strauss, i. 37.
Stuhr, i. 42.
Substitution, i. 318, 387 ff.; ii. 213.
Sufferings of the righteous, i. 232, 305, 310 ff.; ii. 96, 352.
Suicide, i. 218.
Swear, i. 304.
Symbol, i. 276, 279.
Sympathy, i. 58 f.; ii. 74.
Synagogue, i. 428 ff.

T.

Tabernacle, i. 211, 349 ff.
  feast of, i. 336.
Targum, ii. 444.
Temple, i. 156 ff., 333 f., 428.
Temptation, ii. 272 ff.
Teraphim, i. 93, 119, 149, 284.
Thankoffering, i. 378 ff.
Theocracy, i. 136.
Theodicy, ii. 205 ff.
Theophany, i. 186 f., 278; ii. 105 ff.
Toleration, i. 180.
Traducianism, ii. 182.
Transcendentalism, ii. 114 ff.
Transfiguration, i. 276.
Tree-worship, i. 120, 207, 208.
Trial, ii. 211 f.
Trustworthiness, i. 215; ii. 156.
Truthfulness, ii. 52, 156.
Type, ii. 353.
Typology, i. 350.

U.

Unbelief, ii. 290.
Unchastity, ii. 288.
Universalism, ii. 20, 376 ff., 380.
Unnatural unions, ii. 74.
Ur of the Chaldees, i. 106.
Uriah, i. 308.
Urim, i. 128. 284, 346, 411.

V.

Vatke, i. 39, 83, 141.
Virtues, i. 214 ff.
Vision, i. 277.
Vow, i. 191 f., 371 f.

W.

Washings, i. 372.
Watchman, i. 268 f.
Water, pouring out of, i. 189, 372.
Weiss, i. 79.
Welcker, i. 23, 113.
Wellhausen, i. 9, 131, 164, 190, 410, etc.
Wendt, ii. 246, 248, 315.
de Wette, i. 12, 34; ii. 112, 154.
Wieseler, ii. 440.
Wine, i. 163.
Wisdom, i. 216; ii. 83 ff., 121.
  of God, ii. 161 f.
  of Solomon, ii. 398.
Woman, ii. 305.
  seed of, ii. 343 ff.
Women employed in worship, i. 342.
Wonder, i. 297 ff.; ii. 115, 145, 192 ff.
Word of God, ii. 118 ff., 165, 184 ff.
Works, righteousness by, i. 225 f.; ii. 34, 38.
World, government of, ii. 198.
Worship, i. 102 ff., 158, 174 ff., 187 ff., 333 ff.
  law of, i. 188, 333 ff.
  places of, i. 188, 205 ff., 302.
Wurster, i. 73.

Y.

Year-week, ii. 440.

Z.

Zachariæ, i. 82.
Zechariah, i. 70, 249.
Zedekiah, i. 307.
Zerubbabel, i. 326 ff.

INDEX OF HEBREW WORDS AND PHRASES.

א

אֲבַדּוֹן Abaddon, destruction, . . . ii. 325.
אֲבִי עַד Father of Spoil, ... ii. 404.
אֶבְיוֹן needy, ... ii. 298.
אָבִיר strong, ... ii. 129.
אַדִּיר mighty, ... ii. 129.
אָדָם man, Adam, ... i. 115.
אָדוֹן also in plur. אֲדֹנִים, Lord, . . i. 122.
אֹהֶל הָעֵדוּת tent of testimony, ... i. 351.
אוֹב soothsayer, ventriloquist, . . i. 250, 258.
אוּרִים וְתֻמִּים Light and Perfection, . . . i. 284.
אוֹת sign, miracle, ... i. 260, ii. 195.
אַזְכָּרָה remembrance, ... i. 355.
אִיּוֹב Job, the persecuted, . . . i. 319.
אִיִּים wild beasts of desert, . . . ii. 275.
אִוֶּלֶת silliness, ... ii. 284.
אֵל El, God, ... ii. 128.
אֵל בְּרִית Covenant God, ... i. 145.
אֵל גִּבּוֹר Divine Hero, ... ii. 404.
אֵל עֶלְיוֹן Most High God, ... ii. 129.
אֵל שַׁדַּי El Shaddai, God Almighty, . . ii. 130.
אֱלֹהַּ plur. אֱלֹהִים, Elohim, God, . . i. 170, ii. 126 f.
אֱלִילִים No-gods, idols, ... i. 304.
אַף anger, ... ii. 174.
אֶרֶךְ אַפַּיִם long-suffering, ... ii. 178.
אִשֶּׁה sacrifice by fire, ... i. 373, 375.

ב

בִּכּוּרִים First-fruits, ... i. 367.
בְּלִימָה nothing, ... ii. 183.
בְּלִיַּעַל worthlessness, ... ii. 281.
בָּמָה High Place, ... i. 207.
בֵּן son, ... ii. 216.
בְּנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים sons of God, ... i. 115.
בְּנֵי בְלִיַּעַל worthless fellows, ... ii. 281.
בְּנֵי עַוְלָה wicked persons, ... ii. 281.
בַּעַל Plur. בְּעָלִים, Master, Lord, . . i. 148.
בַּעַל חַלֹּמוֹת dreamer, interpreter of dreams, . i. 252, 304.
בַּר יָדַיִם clean-handed, ... ii. 23.
בָּרָא create, form, ... ii. 185.
בְּרֵאשִׁית in the beginning, ... ii. 185.
בְּרָכָה blessing, ... ii. 317.
בָּשָׂר flesh, ... ii. 242, 314 f.
בֹּשֶׁת shame, ... i. 148, 304.
בְּתוּלָה virgin, ... ii. 409.

ג

גְּאוֹן majesty, glory, ... ii. 125.
גָּאַל reclaim, redeem, ... ii. 27.
גָּזַע shoot, ... ii. 405.
גֵּיא בֶן־הִנֹּם Gehenna (valley of son of Hinnom), ii. 376.
גֵּיא חִזָּיוֹן Valley of Vision, ... i. 241.
גַּלְגַּל wheel . . . . . ii. 233.
גִּלּוּלִים logs, idols, ... i. 304.
גֹּלֶם embryo, ... ii. 391.
גֵּרֵי הַצֶּדֶק Proselytes proper, ... i. 427.

ד

דְּבִיר Holy of Holies, ... i. 351.
דּוּמָה silence, ... ii. 325.
דַּךְ crushed, meek, ... ii. 298.
דָּם blood, ... i. 385.

דְּמוּת likeness, ... ii. 257.

דְּמָמָה stillness (a voice of stillness), . . i. 186, ii. 106.

דֹּרֵשׁ אֶל־הַמֵּתִים practising necromancy, . . . i. 258.

ה

הֶבֶל wind (of idols), ... i. 304.

הֵיכָל palace, temple, ... i. 212.

הַכֹּהֲנִים הַלְוִיִּם the Levitical priests, . . . i. 337.

ז

זֶבַח slaughter, sacrifice, ... i. 374.

זָהָב gold, ... i. 364.

זִכָּרוֹן memorial, ... i. 196.

זְקֵנִים elders, ... i. 164.

ח

חַג feast, ... i. 203, 361.

חַג הָאָסִף Feast of Ingathering, . . . i. 368.

חַג הַמַּצּוֹת Feast of Unleavened Bread, . . i. 366.

חַג הַסֻּכּוֹת Feast of Booths, ... i. 368.

חוֹזֶה seer, prophet, ... i. 264, 276.

חִידָה riddle, ... i. 276.

חֶסֶד mercy, grace, ... i. 214, ii. 23.

חֵטְא, חַטָּאת sin, ... i. 380, ii. 282.

חֹטֶר shoot, ... ii. 405.

חָכָם wise, ... i. 250.

חָכְמָה plur. חָכְמוֹת, Wisdom, . . . ii. 86.

חֵלֶב fat, ... i. 379.

חָלָה אֶת־פְּנֵי to smooth the face of, . . . i. 387.

חָמָס wickedness, ... ii. 281.

חֵן, חַנּוּן mercy, merciful, ... ii. 178.

חָנֵף impious, ... ii. 285.

חֲסַר לֵב senseless, ... ii. 284.

חֲצַר הַמִּשְׁכָּן court of the tabernacle, . . . i. 356.

חָרוֹן anger, ... ii. 174.

חֵרֶם a banning, ban, ... i. 391, 393.

חֹשֶׁן High Priest's breast-plate, . . i. 346.

ט

טָהַר purify, ... i. 399.

טָמֵא unclean, ... ii. 166.

י

יָבַם marry deceased brother's childless wife, ... ii. 63.

יִדְּעֹנִי wizard, ... i. 250.

יְהוּדִים Jews, ... i. 331.

יוֹבֵל Jubilee, ... i. 363.

יְהוָה Jahve, Jehovah, ... ii. 13, 131 ff.

יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת Jehovah of Hosts, ... ii. 139.

יְהוָה צִדְקֵנוּ Jehovah our Righteousness, . . ii. 418.

יוֹם יְהוָה The day of the Lord, . . . ii. 356.

יֹשֵׁב הַכְּרוּבִים He who sits upon the Cherubim, . ii. 230.

יָשָׁר upright, righteous, ... ii. 23.

יְשֻׁרוּן Jeshurun, ... ii. 29.

כ

כָּבוֹד glory, ... ii. 125.

כִּבֵּס to wash clean, ... ii. 99.

כֹּהֵן priest, ... i. 127, 202, 343.

כָּלִיל whole burnt-offering, . . . i. 375, 376.

כְּנֶסֶת synagogue, ... i. 429.

כִּסָּה cover up, ... ii. 99.

כְּסִיל, כֶּסֶל headstrong folly, foolish, . . ii. 284.

כֶּסֶף silver, ... i. 376.

כִּפֶּר, כֹּפֶר to cover, atone, atonement, . . i. 389, 398.

כַּפֹּרֶת covering, mercy-seat, . . . i. 354.

כְּרוּבִים Cherubim, ... i. 185, 352, 354. ii. 229 ff.

ל

לֵב heart, mind, ... ii. 252.

לָבַשׁ clothe, ... i. 266.

לְוִיִּם Levites, ... i. 337, 426.

לֶחֶם אִשֶּׁה food of sacrifice by fire, . . . i. 373.
לֶחֶם הַפָּנִים shewbread (bread of the face), . i. 355.
לֵץ scorner, ... ii. 284.

מ

מוּסָר correction, instruction, . . . ii. 298.
מוֹפֵת remarkable occurrence, miracle, . ii. 195.
מוֹעֵד fixed time, appointed feast, . . i. 361.
מוֹצָאוֹת goings forth, issues, . . . ii. 415.
מוֹשֶׁה Moses (derivation of), . . . i. 125.
מוֹרֶה (1) teacher, (2) early rain, . . ii. 426.
מִזְבֵּחַ altar, ... i. 356, 375.
מַזְכִּיר Remembrancer, Recorder, . . i. 413.
מְזִמָּה crafty thoughts, ... ii. 162.
מְכוֹנָה a base, ... ii. 233.
מִלֵּא אַחֲרֵי יהוה to follow fully after Jehovah, . . ii. 32.
מַלְאַךְ יהוה Angel of Jehovah, ... ii. 419.
מִלָּה word, ... ii. 349.
מְלִיצִים interpreters, prophets, . . . i. 268.
מִנְחָה meal-offering, ... i. 374.
מְנֹרַת זָהָב golden candlestick, ... i. 355.
מַצּוֹת unleavened cakes, ... i. 366.
מִקְרָא קֹדֶשׁ a holy assembly, ... i. 369.
מַרְבִּית interest, usury, ... ii. 58.
מִרְמָה deceit, ... ii. 284.
מַשָּׂא דְּבַר יהוה oracle of the word of Jehovah, . i. 266.
מִשְׁכַּן הָעֵדוּת the dwelling-place of the testimony, i. 351.
מָשָׁל a proverb, taunt-song, . . . i. 279.

נ

נְאֻם יהוה a whispered utterance of Jehovah, . i. 266.
נָבוֹן prudent, ... ii. 23.
נְבָלָה folly, ... ii. 284.
נְבֵלָה corpse, ... ii. 72.
נָבִיא prophet, ... i. 240, 259, 264.

נָכוֹן established, sure, sincere, . . ii. 32.
נְתוּנִים persons given, also נְתִינִים, . . i. 343.
נְדָבָה free-will offering, ... i. 378.
נֵדֶר vow, ... i. 162, 371.
נֵזֶר a crown, ... i. 162.
נְחֻשְׁתָּן Nehushtan, ... i. 150.
נִפְלָאוֹת wonders, miracles, ... ii. 195.
נֶפֶשׁ soul, person, ... i. 385, ii. 314.
נֵצַח for ever, ... ii. 266.
נָקִי innocent, ... ii. 307.
נְקִיוֹן innocence, ... ii. 98.
נָשָׂא עָוֹן to bear iniquity, ... ii. 89, 99, 307.
נְשִׂיאִים rulers, ... i. 164.
נְשִׁיָּה forgetfulness, ... ii. 325.
נֶשֶׁךְ usury, ... ii. 58.
נְשָׁמָה breath, ... ii. 253.

ס

סַכּוּת name of Assyrian war-god Adar, "He who cuts off the head," . . i. 90.
סֻכּוֹת booths, ... i. 368.
סֹפֵר scribe, ... i. 413.
סֹפֵר מָהִיר ready writer, ... i. 413.
סוֹרְרִים rebellious, ... ii. 286.

ע

עֶבֶד יהוה servant of Jehovah, ... i. 266, 311.
עֶבְרָה wrath, ... ii. 174.
עֵדָה congregation, ... ii. 8.
עוֹלָה burnt-offering, ... i. 356, 375.
עוֹלַת תָּמִיד continual burnt-offering, . . i. 377.
עָוֹן perversity, iniquity, . . . ii. 306.
עֲזָאזֵל . . . . . i. 403 ff.
עֵזֶר כְּנֶגְדּוֹ a helpmeet, ... ii. 51.
עֲטָרוֹת crowns, ... ii. 410.
עַלְמָה marriageable woman, . . . ii. 409 ff.

עֲלָמִים secret sins, ... ii. 283.
עָמָל burden, sorrow, ... ii. 285.
עִמָּנוּאֵל Immanuel, ... ii. 410.
עִנָּה נֶפֶשׁ to afflict the soul, ... i. 67, 402.
עִקֵּשׁ perverse, ... ii. 284.
עֹשֶׁק oppression, ... ii. 285.

פ

פָּדָה redeem, ... i. 136, 392, ii. 27.
פֶּלֶא a wonder, ... ii. 195, 404.
פָּנִים face, ... ii. 220.
פֶּסַח Passover, ... i. 365.
פְּקֵחַ open-eyed, ... i. 313.
פָּרֹכֶת veil, ... i. 354.
פֶּתִי Plur. פְּתָאִים, simple, credulous, . ii. 283.
פִּתָּרוֹן interpretation, ... i. 252.

צ

צָבָא Host, ... ii. 139 ff.
צַדִּיק just, ... ii. 152.
צִיִּים wild beasts of desert, . . . ii. 275.
צֶלֶם likeness, ... i. 90.
צֶמַח sprout, ... ii. 422.
צָפָה and Part. Piel מְצַפֶּה, watchman, . i. 269.
צְפְצָף chirp (of Manes), ... i. 253.

ק

קָדוֹשׁ holy, ... i. 271.
קֶדֶם of old, ... i. 259.
קִדֵּשׁ sanctify, ... i. 399.
קֹדֶשׁ הַקָּדָשִׁים Holy of Holies, ... i. 351.
קָהָל assembly, ecclesia, ... i. 399.
קֹהֶלֶת Qoheleth, Ecclesiastes, . . . i. 78, 432.
קִינָה, a dirge, plur. קִינוֹת, "Lamentations," i. 279.
קְטֹרֶת incense, ... i. 374.

קְטֹרֶת הַסַּמִּים incense of sweet spices, . . . i. 356.
קְלָלָה curse, ... ii. 317.
קָנָה to purchase, ... i. 136, 392, ii. 27.
קֹסֵם a diviner, ... i. 258.
קְצִיר חִטִּים wheat-harvest, ... i. 367.
קָרְבָּן gift, ... i. 364, 374.

ר

רֹאֶה seer, prophet, ... i. 240.
רַהַב pride, ... ii. 286.
רַחֲמִים mercy, ... ii. 157.
רֵיחַ נִיחֹחַ sweet-smelling savour, . . . i. 189, 373.
רִמָּה worm, ... ii. 376.
רְמִיָּה treachery, ... ii. 284.
רֶמֶשׂ creeping thing, ... ii. 77.
רְפָאִים The Shades, ... ii. 326.
רָצוֹן favour, acceptance, ... i. 189.
רָשָׁע wicked, ... ii. 22.

שׂ

שָׂטָן Satan, Adversary, ... ii. 275.
שָׂכַל Hiph. הִשְׂכִּיל, to view attentively, act wisely, ... i. 417, ii. 305.
שְׂעִירִים Satyrs, ... ii. 271.
שָׂרִים princes, ... i. 164.
שַׂר שָׁלוֹם Prince of Peace, ... ii. 404.

שְׁאוֹל Sheol, the under-world, . . . ii. 325.
שָׁבַע in Niph. נִשְׁבַּע, swear, . . . i. 266.
שָׁבֻעוֹת weeks, ... i. 367.
שַׁבָּת Sabbath, ... i. 205, 362, ii. 284.
שְׁגָגָה inadvertence, ... i. 389, ii. 89.
שְׁגִיאָה error, ... ii. 283.
שְׁדִים demons, ... ii. 275.
שֹׁד oppression, ... ii. 285.
שָׁוְא vanity, ... i. 261, 304.
שׁוּב שְׁבוּת to turn captivity, ... ii. 363.

שַׁוְעָתִי my crying, ... i. 317.
שׁוֹק הַתְּרוּמָה the shoulder of the heave-offering, . i. 379.
שָׁחֵת act corruptly, ... ii. 286.
שִׁילֹה Shiloh, ... ii. 338 ff.
שְׁלָמִים Thank-offerings, ... i. 378.
שְׁמִטָּה release, ... ii. 11.
שִׁקּוּץ abomination, ... i. 304, ii. 78.
שֶׁקֶר deceit, ... i. 304, ii. 284.
שְׁרִירוּת stubbornness, ... ii. 286.
שָׁרַת to minister, Part. מְשָׁרֵת, . . . i. 212.

ת

תְּבוּנָה understanding, ... ii. 162.
תֹּהוּ chaos, ... i. 304.
תּוֹדָה praise, ... i. 378.
תּוֹרָה instruction, law, Thorah, . . i. 188, 321.
תּוֹכַחַת, תּוֹכָחָה rebuke, ... ii. 298.
תּוֹלַעַת worm, ... ii. 376.
תּוֹעֵבָה abomination, ... i. 304, ii. 78.
תּוּשִׁיָּה sound wisdom, success, . . . ii. 80, 86.
תְּנוּפָה wave-offering, ... i. 379.
תְּקוּפָה circuit, course, ... i. 368.
תְּרוּמָה heave-offering, ... i. 398.
תַּחַת under, instead of, ... i. 387.
תָּמִים perfect, ... ii. 23.

INDEX OF TEXTS.

GENESIS.

i., . . . ii. 183 ff.
ii.–iii., . . ii. 258 ff.
i. 29, . . ii. 76.
iii. 15, . . ii. 343 ff.
iv. 1, . . ii. 27.
iv. 26, . . i. 88.
vi. 1–3, . . i. 114 ff.; ii. 269 ff.
vi. 1–4, . . ii. 314 f.
ix. 1, . . i. 88.
ix. 4, . . i. 385.
ix. 4–7, . . ii. 6.
ix. 25–27, . ii. 346.
xi. 30, . . i. 94.
xii. 1–4, . ii. 33.
xiv. 13, . ii. 3.
xv. 6, . . i. 52.
xv. 18, . . ii. 2.
xx. 7, . . i. 237.
xx. 12, . . i. 192.
xxiv. 9, . i. 195.
xxvi. 7, . i. 89.
xxvi. 28, . ii. 4.
xxviii. 20, . i. 179.
xxx. 18, . i. 217.
xxxii. 24, . i. 117.
xxxii. 25, . i. 55.
xxxv. 14, . i. 120.
xlix., . . ii. 124, 335 ff.
xlix. 5, . . i. 200.
xlix. 10, . ii. 337 ff.

EXODUS.

ii. 21, . . i. 92.
iii. 14, . . ii. 138.
iii. 18, . . i. 128.
iv. 16, . . ii. 127.
iv. 22, . . ii. 9.
iv. 24 ff., . i. 117, 188.
v. 3, . . i. 128.
v. 7, . . i. 92.
vi. 3, . . ii. 123, 136.
vii. 1, . . ii. 127.
vii. 16, . . i. 128.
x. 3, . . i. 128.
xiii. 17, . i. 137.
xiv. . . . i. 201.
xv. 18, . . ii. 8.
xviii. 19, . i. 136.
xix ff., . . i. 67.
xix. 5, . . i. 138.
xx. 10, . . i. 205.
xx. 19, . . i. 131.
xxxii., . . i. 92.
xxxiii. 7, . ii. 143.
xxxiv. 10 ff., i. 219.

LEVITICUS.

i. 9, . . . i. 373.
ii. 13, . . i. 374.
iii. 11, . . i. 373.
iv. 24, . . i. 380.
v. 1–13, . i. 380 f.
vi. 10, . . i. 380.
vi. 14, . . i. 375.
vi. 20, . . i. 384.
vii. 7, . . i. 380.
vii. 16, . . i. 378.
viii. 28, . i. 373.
x. 9, . . . ii. 75.
x. 12, . . i. 375.
x. 16, . . ii. 239.
xi. 45, . . i. 138.
xvi. 7–28, . i. 403 ff.
xvi. 28, . . i. 396.
xvi. 29, . . i. 402.
xvii ff., . . i. 73.
xvii. 10, 11, i. 385.
xviii. 21, . i. 234.
xix. 2, . . i. 138.
xx. 5, . . i. 234.
xxi. 6, . . i. 373.
xxii. 24, . ii. 74.
xxiii. 8, . i. 309.
xxvii. 26, . i. 372.

NUMBERS.

iii. 20, . . i. 126.
vi. 1, . . i. 161.
xii. 3, . . i. 140.
xii. 6, . . i. 131.
xii. 6, . . i. 288.
xii. 7, . . ii. 8.
xii. 8, . . i. 276.
xiv. 9, . . i. 179.
xv. 3, . . i. 375.
xv. 30, . . ii. 88.
xv. 40, . . i. 138.
xvi. 1, . . i. 140.
xxi. 14, . i. 62.
xxii. 8, . . i. 276.
xxiii. 10, . ii. 317.
xxiv. 4, . i. 254.
xxiv. 24, . i. 65.
xxvii. 21, . i. 284.
xxx. 2, . . i. 372.
xxx. 14, . i. 372.
xxxi. 8–16, i. 255.
xxxiii. 38, . i. 283.

DEUTERONOMY.

v. 1, . . i. 132.
v. 14, . . i. 426.
vi. 4, . . i. 34.
vii. 7, . . ii. 30.
vii. 22, . . i. 144.
xi. 10–17, . ii. 35.
xiii. 2 ff., . i. 256.

xiii. 3, . . i. 260.
xiv. 29, . i. 426.
xviii. 9, . i. 259.
xviii. 11, . ii. 322.
xviii. 15, . ii. 425 f.
xviii. 20, . i. 260.
xxi. 1 ff., . i. 398.
xxii. 5, . . ii. 74.
xxiv. 19, . i. 426.
xxvii. 5, . i. 209.
xxxii. 8, 9, i. 227.
xxxii. 15, . ii. 29.
xxxii. 43, . i. 397.
xxxiii. 5, . i. 136; ii. 29.
xxxiii. 8, . i. 199.
xxxiii. 19, . i. 157.
xxxiv. 10, . i. 131.

JOSHUA.

i. 8, . . . i. 142.
iv. 4, . . i. 196.
v. 9, . . i. 193.
x. 13, . . i. 62.
xi. 17, . . i. 114.
xiii. 13, . i. 143.
xiv. 7, . . i. 266.
xiv. 14, . i. 426.
xv. 63, . . i. 143.
xviii. 1, . i. 147.
xxii., . . i. 209.
xxiv. 2, 3, . i. 95, 97.
xxiv, 23, . i. 112.

JUDGES.

i. 21, . . i. 142.
iii. 15, . . i. 26.
iv. 4, . . i. 206.
iv. 11–17, . i. 91, 201.
v. 20, . . ii. 194.
v. 23, . . i. 137.
vi. 18, . . i. 190.
vi. 28, . . i. 183.
vii. 13, . . i. 252.
viii. 22, . i. 136.
viii. 23, . i. 148.
ix. 13, . . i. 121.
ix. 28, . . i. 144.
xi. 35, . . i. 191.
xii. 1, . . i. 147.
xvii. 6, . . i. 167.
xvii. 7, 8, 11, i. 67.
xviii. 5–14, i. 119.
xix. 16, . i. 26.
xix. 46, . i. 145.
xx. 13, . . ii. 281.

RUTH.

i. 4, . . . i. 144.
i. 16, . . i. 216.
ii. 2, . . i. 150.
iv. 3–14, . i. 285.
iv. 5, . . ii. 63.
iv. 18–22, . ii. 18.

1 SAMUEL.

i. 1, . . . i. 151.
i. 13, . . i. 378.
ii. 1–10, . i. 64.
ii. 15, . . i. 379.
vii. 6, . . i. 189, 374.
viii. 6, . . i. 165.
viii. 7, . . i. 136.
ix. 9, . . i. 240.
ix. 24, . . i. 379.
x. 12, . . i. 241.
xiv. 3, . . i. 150, 284.
xiv. 32, . ii. 72.
xvi. 16, . i. 243.
xix. 13, . i. 119.
xix. 19. . i. 241; ii. 205.
xx. 1, . . i. 241.
xxvi. 19, . i. 392.

2 SAMUEL.

i. 18, . . i. 62.
iii. 27, . . i. 150.
vi. 2, . . ii. 177.
vii. 1, . . i. 270.
vii. 6, . . i. 212.
vii. 23, . . i. 228.
xvi. 23, . i. 285.
xix. 21, . i. 28.
xx. 18, . . i. 146.
xxiii. 11, . i. 201.
xxiii. 14, . i. 386.

1 KINGS.

iv. 2, 5, . i. 202.
ix. 11, . . i. 156.
ix. 20, . . i. 143.
x. 9, . . i. 178.
xii. 10, . . i. 156.
xiii. 1, 32, . i. 288.
xviii. 30, . i. 157.
xix. 12, . . i. 186.
xix. 19, . . i. 241.
xxi. 3, . . ii. 11.
xxii. 21, . ii. 205.

2 KINGS.

i. 2, 33, . i. 122, 285.
ii. 12, . . i. 271.
iii. 26, . . i. 192.
iv. 13, . . i. 155.
iv. 42, . . i. 242.
v. 15, . . i. 178.
viii. 10, . i. 251.
xiii. 14, . i. 271.
xvii. 11, . i. 233.
xviii. 3, . i. 231.
xxiii. 26, . i. 78.

1 CHRONICLES.

vi. 28, . . i. 151.
xvi. 36, . i. 143.
xvi. 40, . i. 377.
xviii. 17, . i. 202.

2 CHRONICLES.

ii. 17, . . i. 143.
xi. 15, . . ii. 278.
xxiii., . . i. 77.
xxiv. 20, . i. 266.
xxxiii. 11, . i. 234.

EZRA.

ii. 63, . . i. 411.
iii. 2, . . i. 416.
iv. 2, . . ii. 17.
vi. 18, . . i. 416.
vi. 21, . . i. 427.
vii. 6, 10, . i. 414, 419.
viii. 15, . i. 416.

NEHEMIAH.

ii. 13, . . i. 206.
ii. 18, . . i. 415.
vi. 7, 10, . i. 412.
vii. 65, . . i. 411.
viii. 1, . . i. 415.
x. 20, . . i. 427.
xii. 13, . . i. 76.

ESTHER.

iv. 3, . . ii. 42.
viii. 11, . . ii. 17.
ix. 1–16, . ii. 19.
ix. 19, . . ii. 42.

JOB.

i., . . . i. 275 ff.
i. 5, . . . ii. 69.
i. 21, . . ii. 251.
iii. 8, . . i. 185.
iv. 13, . . i. 275, 277.
iv. 18, . . ii. 227.
v. 6, . . ii. 209.
ix. 9, . . i. 185.
x. 4, . . ii. 244.
xi. 10, . . ii. 202.
xii. 5, . . ii. 211.
xv. 4, . . ii. 85.
xvii. 8 f., . ii. 211.
xix. 25 ff., . ii. 329 ff.
xxvi. 12 f., i. 227.
xxxi. 1, . ii. 3.
xxxi. 33, . ii. 261.
xxxiii. 15, . i. 277.
xxxiii. 23, . i. 268.
xxxiii. 26, . i. 371.
xxxviii. 3, . i. 185.
xxxviii. 7, . ii. 140, 228.
xxxviii. 38-41, ii. 191.

PSALMS.

ii. 4, . . i. 137.
vi. 2, . . ii. 175.
vi. 9, . . ii. 289.
vii. 10, . . ii. 152.
viii., . . i. 64; ii. 101, 255.
xvi., . . ii. 265 ff.
xvii. 15, . ii. 81, 122, 267 ff.
xviii., . . i. 64.
xviii. 25, . ii. 23.
xviii. 36, . ii. 159.
xix., . . i. 265.
xx. 4, . . i. 189.
xxii., . . ii. 448 f.
xxii. 2, . . i. 317.
xxvii. 6, . i. 378.
xxix., . . i. 64; ii. 101.
xxxvi. 7, . i. 208.
xxxix. 13, . ii. 15.
xlv., . . i. 168, 389; ii. 114, 448.
xlviii. 15, . i. 170.
xlix., . . ii. 387 ff.
xlix. 7, 8, . i. 392.
l. 5, . . . ii. 14.
li., . . . ii. 311.
li. 18, . . ii. 94.
lviii. 4, . . ii. 297.
lxiii. 2, . . ii. 243.
lxix., . . ii. 448 ff.
lxxii., . . i. 168; ii. 370.
lxxiii., . . ii. 389 f.
lxxiv., . . i. 406, 413, 429.
xc. 3, . . ii. 392.
xcii. 6, . . ii. 86.
civ. 5, . . ii. 229.
civ. 16, . i. 208.
cv. 1, . . i. 78.
cv. 15, . . ii. 16.
cx. 1, . . ii. 429, 450.
cx. 2, 4, . i. 137, 168, 169.
cxv. 11, . i. 427.
cxxv. 3, . ii. 26.
cxxxvii., . ii. 17.
cxxxix. 2, . ii. 9, 139, 391 ff.
cxxxix. 15, ii. 251 ff.
cxli. 5, . . ii. 299.
cxlviii. 6, . ii. 192.
cxlviii. 8, . ii. 229.

PROVERBS.

ii. 7, . . ii. 80.
iii. 18, . . i. 66.
vii. 14, . . i. 379.
viii. 22-23, ii. 181.
ix. 12, . . ii. 310.
xi. 16, . . i. 155.
xi. 25, . . i. 151.
xi. 30, . . i. 66.
xii. 4, . . i. 155.
xii. 10, . . i. 214.
xiii. 12, . i. 66.
xiv. 28, . i. 167.
xv. 8, . . i. 371.
xv. 33, . . ii. 298.
xvi. 4, . . ii. 157.
xvi. 10, . i. 167.
xviii. 5, . i. 151, 214.
xviii. 12, . i. 214.
xix. 14, . i. 155.
xix. 17, . i. 151, 214.
xix. 26, . i. 214.
xx. 8, . . i. 167.
xx. 10, . . i. 151.
xxi. 4, . . i. 214.
xxi. 13, . i. 151.
xxi. 18, . i. 390.
xxii. 4, . . i. 214.
xxii. 9, . . i. 151.
xxii. 11, . i. 167.
xxvii. 19, . ii. 300.
xxxi., . . ii. 53.

ECCLESIASTES.

i. 1, 2, . . i. 435 f.
iii., . . . ii. 398.
iii. 1-9, . i. 435.
iv. 10, . . ii. 115.
v. 5,. . . i. 269.
vii. 16, . . ii. 43.
vii. 20, . . ii. 24.
vii. 29, . . ii. 258.
viii. 8, . . ii. 398.
ix. 3-10, . ii. 393.
xi. 9, . . i. 437.
xii. 7, . . ii. 245, 393.
xii. 12, . . i. 417.
xii. 14, . . i. 437.

ISAIAH.

i. 9, . . . i. 222.
ii. 6, . . i. 259.
iv. 2, . . ii. 407.
vi. 1, . . ii. 106.
vi. 1-6,. . ii. 237 ff.
vi. 13, . . ii. 359.
vii. 8, . . i. 288.
vii. 14 ff., . ii. 304 ff., 408-414.
vii. 17, . . i. 225; ii. 449.
viii. 10, . ii. 410.
viii. 19, . i. 253, 259.
x. 14, 19, . i. 259.
xi. 1-3, . . ii. 405 ff.
xiii. 10, . ii. 357.
xiv. 9, . . ii. 326.
xvi. 14, . i. 287.
xix. 3, . . i. 259.
xx. 2, . . i. 266.
xxi. 11, . i. 268.
xxi. 16, . i. 287.
xxiii. 29, . i. 263.
xxv. 3, . . ii. 378.
xxv. 8, . . ii. 384.
xxvi. 15, . ii. 381.
xxvi. 17, . ii. 354.
xxvi. 19, . ii. 387.
xxviii. 9, . i. 249, 263.
xxviii.15,18, i. 269; ii. 406 f.
xxx. 19, . ii. 426.
xxxi. 3, . ii. 244.
xxxii. 1-8,. ii. 407.
xxxv. 10, . ii. 385 f.
xxxvi. 10, . i. 229.
xl. 2, . . ii. 361.
xlii. 19, . ii. 379.
xliii. 3,4,28, i. 115, 173; ii. 92.

xliv. 5, . . ii. 370.
xlv. 8, 23, . ii. 368, 377.
xlviii. 16, . i. 265.
xlix. 1, 2, . i. 267; ii. 427.
lii. 13–liii. 12, ii. 430–435, 450.
liv. 6, . . ii. 90, 250.
lv. 10, . . ii. 193.
lvi. 10, . . i. 261.
lxiii. 8, . . ii. 29.
lxiii. 10, . ii. 111.
lxv, 11, 20, i. 114; ii. 368, 385 f.
lxvi. 1, . . i. 209.
lxvi. 21, 23, ii. 380 f.

Jeremiah.

ii. 19, . . i. 189.
ii. 30, . . i. 273.
iii. 16, . . ii. 368.
v. 13, . . i. 286.
vii. 25, . . i. 239.
vii. 31, . . ii. 376.
viii. 8, . . i. 413.
ix. 25, . . i. 193.
x. 5, . . . i. 90.
xi. 19, . . i. 240.
xiii. 1, . . i. 279.
xiii. 3, . . i. 173.
xv. 4, . . i. 78.
xv. 10, . . i. 249.
xvii. 16, . i. 274.
xvii. 19, . i. 273.
xxiii. 6, . ii. 418.
xxvi. 2, . i. 273.
xxviii. 6, . i. 274.
xxix. 22, . i. 78.
xxx. 2, . . i. 280.
xxxi. 29, . ii. 207.
xxxi. 34, . ii. 424.
xxxii. 18, . ii. 141.
xxxiii. 14–26, ii. 418.
xxxv., . . i. 91.
xxxv. 2, . i. 163.
xxxvi. 19, . i. 249.
xxxvi. 26, . i. 413.
xliv. 15, 29, i. 299, 301.
l. 2, . . . i. 285.
l. 28, . . i. 75.
li. 11–51, . i. 75.

Lamentations.

ii. 9, . . . i. 172.
ii. 9, 14, . i. 277.
ii. 14, . . i. 262.
iii. 24, . . ii. 79.
iii. 27–30, . ii. 213.
iii. 31, . . ii. 179.
iv. 20, . . i. 172.

Ezekiel.

i., . . . ii. 232 ff.
iii. 17, . . i. 268.
iv. 4, . . i. 388.
iv. 5, . . i. 288.
vii. 26, . . i. 261.
viii. 1, . . i. 428.
viii. 3, . . i. 266.
xi. 5, . . ii. 245.
xiii. 2, . . i. 261.
xiii. 9, . . i. 260.
xvi. 20, . i. 207.
xvii. 22, . ii. 420.
xviii. 10–13, ii. 310.
xx. 8, . . i. 140.
xx. 16, . . i. 90.
xx. 25, . . ii. 56.
xx. 30, . . i. 234.
xxi. 26, . i. 119.
xxi. 32, . ii. 420.
xxiii. 3, . i. 140.
xxvii. 23, . ii. 230.
xxix. 21, . ii. 420.
xxxii. 19, . i. 193.
xxxiv. 23, . ii. 420.
xxxvii., . ii. 383 ff.
xliii. 26, . i. 198.
xliv., . . ii. 428.
xlv. 8, . . ii. 420.

Daniel.

i. 8, . . . ii. 64.
i. 17, . . i. 413.
ii. 33, . . ii. 438.
iii. 18, . . ii. 42.
v. 11, . . i. 413.
vii. 3, . . ii. 438.
vii. 18, . . ii. 439.
vii. 25, . . ii. 439.
viii. 4, 6, . ii. 438.
viii. 10, . ii. 16.
viii. 15, . ii. 240.
ix. 2, . . . i. 417.
ix. 2, . . . ii. 438.
ix. 21, . . ii. 226.
ix. 24, . . i. 397.
ix. 25 f., . ii. 440 ff.
x. 7, . . . i. 413.
xii. 1, . . ii. 240.
xii. 2, . . ii. 392.
xii. 3, . . i. 417.

Hosea.

i. 4, . . . i. 159.
i. 7, . . . i. 160.
ii. 2, . . . i. 160.
ii. 7, 11, . i. 203.
iii. 4, . . i. 119.
iv. 7, . . i. 73.
iv. 8, . . i. 389.
v. 6, . . . i. 371.
v. 10, . . i. 171.
vi. 1, . . ii. 383.
vi. 5, . . i. 274.
vii. 12, . . i. 73.
viii. 5, . . i. 221; ii. 98.
ix. 7, 8, . i. 247.
xi. 1, . . ii. 9.
xi. 8, . . i. 66.
xi. 9, . . ii. 172.
xii. 4, . . i. 66, 118.
xii. 5, . . i. 187.
xii. 11, . . i. 279.
xii. 14, . . i. 138.
xiii. 14, . . i. 229; ii. 383.
xiv. 10, . . ii. 153.

Joel.

i. 15, . . i. 287.
ii. 1, . . . i. 287.
ii. 11, . . ii. 192.
ii. 12, . . ii. 295.
ii. 18, . . ii. 179.
ii. 21, . . ii. 195.
ii. 23, . . ii. 426.
iii. 1, . . i. 277.
iv. 2, 12, . ii. 375.

Amos.

i. 1, . . . i. 247.
ii. 1, . . i. 66.
ii. 1, . . . i. 229.
ii. 4, . . ii. 366.
ii. 10, . . i. 66.
ii. 12, . . i. 162.
ii. 12, . . i. 247.
ii. 12, . . i. 286.
iii. 1, . . i. 66.
iii. 6, . . ii. 197.
iv. 3, . . i. 160.
iv. 5, . . i. 75.
iv. 5, . . i. 221.
iv. 10, . . ii. 56.
iv. 11, . . i. 66.
v. 2, . . i. 204.

v. 2, . . i. 226.
v. 21, . . i. 204.
v. 22, . . i. 73.
v. 25, . . i. 66.
v. 26, . . i. 90.
vii. 10, . . i. 202.
vii. 13, . . i. 247.
vii. 14, . . i. 221.
vii. 14, . . i. 243.
vii. 16, . . i. 249.
vii. 17, . . ii. 69.
viii. 5, . . ii. 56.
viii. 14, . i. 221.
ix. 7, . . i. 229.
ix. 11, . . i. 172.

OBADIAH.

1, . . . i. 277.
2, . . . ii. 375.
15, . . . ii. 356.
18–20, . . ii. 370.

JONAH.

i. 3 ff., . . i. 267.
ii. 1, 11, . i. 267.
ii. 5, . . ii. 81.
iii. 4, . . i. 287.
iv. 6 ff., . ii. 192.

MICAH.

ii. 1, . . ii. 57, 128, 291.
ii. 6, . . i. 249.
ii. 7, . . ii. 175.
ii. 12, . . ii. 360.
iii. 5, . . i. 262.
iv. 9 ff., . ii. 414–416.
v. 1 ff., . . ii. 414–416.
vi. 2, . . i. 66.
vi. 4, . . i. 138.
vi. 5, . . i. 255.
vi. 6, . . i. 188, 376.
vii. 17, . . i. 66.

NAHUM.

i. 1, . . . i. 277.
i. 5, . . . ii. 176.
i. 7, . . . ii. 35.
i. 11, . . ii. 128.
ii. 1, . . i. 287.
iii. 4, . . i. 258.

HABAKKUK.

i. 1, . . . i. 269.
ii. 2, . . i. 273.
ii. 3, . . i. 287.
ii. 4, . . ii. 35.
iii. 2, . . ii. 179.

ZEPHANIAH.

i. 12, . . i. 296.
i. 14, . . i. 357.
ii. 2, . . i. 176.
iii. 3 f., . . i. 289.
iii. 9, . . i. 178.

HAGGAI.

i. 7 ff., . . ii. 192.
i. 13, . . i. 269; ii. 225.
ii. 23 f., . i. 174; ii. 422.

ZECHARIAH.

i. 12, . . ii. 227.
ii. 11, . . i. 427.
iii., . . . ii. 277 f.
iii. 2, . . ii. 92.
iii. 8, . . ii. 422 f.
iv. 6, . . i. 174.
v. 9, . . . ii. 226.
vi. 11, . . i. 428; ii. 423.
vii. 3, . . i. 162, 431.
viii. 4, . . ii. 385 f.
ix.–xi., . . ii. 416 f.
x. 2, . . . i. 119.
xi. 9, . . ii. 319.
xii.–xiv., . ii. 418 ff.
xiii. 7, . . ii. 436 f.
xiv. 20, . . ii. 369.

MALACHI.

i. 2–4, . . ii. 19.
i. 11, . . i. 424.
iii. 1, . . i. 269; ii. 16.
iv. 5, . . ii. 357.

ECCLESIASTICUS.

i. 1, . . . ii. 164.
xvi. 7, . . i. 419.
xvii. 14, . ii. 20.
xxxviii. 24, i. 418.
xl. 1, . . ii. 251.
l., . . . i. 412; ii. 17.

WISDOM OF SOLOMON.

i. 12, . . ii. 398.
ii. 13, . . ii. 115.
vii. 21, . . ii. 164.
xi. 17, . . i. 419.

JUDITH.

iv. 7, . . ii. 21.
viii. 19, . i. 419.
xvi. 20, . ii. 395.

BARUCH.

i. 5, . . . ii. 44.
ii. 2, . . i. 419.
iii. 10, . . ii. 396.
iii. 36, . . ii. 20.

TOBIT.

iii. 8, . . ii. 280.
viii. 6, . . i. 419.
xii. 9, . . ii. 44.
xii. 15, . . ii. 241.

1 MACCABEES.

i. 59, . . i. 420.
iv. 56, . . i. 431.
xv. 41, . . i. 413.

2 MACCABEES.

i. 18, . . i. 417.
vi. 10, . . ii. 44.
viii. 23, . i. 420.
ix. 17, . . ii. 17.
x. 6, . . . i. 431.

3 MACCABEES.

ii. 4, . . i. 420.

FOREIGN THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY.

'No preacher who values his ministry can afford to be a non-subscriber to the "Foreign Theological Library." The subscription is almost ridiculously small in comparison to the value received.'—*Homilist.*

MESSRS. CLARK beg to invite the attention of Clergymen and educated Laymen to this Series.

Forty-five years have now elapsed since the commencement of the FOREIGN THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY, and during that time Four Volumes annually (or 180 in all) have appeared with the utmost regularity.

It is now, however, difficult to preserve this regularity; and, whilst the Publishers will continue to issue translations of the best German and French works, they will do so as occasion offers, and thus the publications will be even more select.

In completing the FOREIGN THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY as a series, they desire anew to express their grateful thanks to the Subscribers for their support.

They trust and believe that the whole series has exercised, through the care with which the books have been selected, a healthy influence upon the progress of theological science in this country and the United States.

In order to bring the FOREIGN THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY more within the reach of all, it has been decided to allow a selection of

EIGHT VOLUMES at the Subscription Price of TWO GUINEAS

(or more at the same ratio), from the works issued previous to 1888, a complete list of which will be found on the following page.

N.B.—No *duplicates* can be included in such selections.

The Volumes issued during 1888–1890 were:—

1888.—**CASSEL'S COMMENTARY ON ESTHER.**
EWALD'S OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT THEOLOGY.
KEIL'S BIBLICAL ARCHÆOLOGY. Vol. II. (completion).
DELITZSCH'S NEW COMMENTARY ON GENESIS. Vol. I.

1889.—**DELITZSCH'S NEW COMMENTARY ON GENESIS. Vol. II. (completion).**
ORELLI'S COMMENTARY ON ISAIAH.
ORELLI'S COMMENTARY ON JEREMIAH.
LUTHARDT'S HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN ETHICS. Vol. I.

1890.—**SCHÜRER'S HISTORY OF THE JEWISH PEOPLE IN THE TIME OF JESUS CHRIST. First Division. 2 Vols.**
DELITZSCH'S COMMENTARY ON ISAIAH. New Edition. 2 Vols.

N.B.—To complete Sets, any of the above Yearly Issues may be had at the Subscription Price of Twenty-one Shillings.

THE FOREIGN THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY.

The following are the Works from which a Selection of EIGHT VOLUMES for £2, 2s. (or more at the same ratio) may be made. (Non-subscription Price within brackets):—

Alexander—Commentary on Isaiah. Two Vols. (17s.)
Baumgarten—The History of the Church in the Apostolic Age. Three Vols. (27s.)
Bleek—Introduction to the New Testament. Two Vols. (21s.)
Christlieb—Modern Doubt and Christian Belief. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
Delitzsch—Commentary on Job. Two Vols. (21s.) *New Edition shortly.*
—— Commentary on the Psalms. Three Vols. (31s. 6d.)
—— Commentary on the Proverbs of Solomon. Two Vols. (21s.)
—— Commentary on Song of Solomon and Ecclesiastes. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
—— Commentary on the Prophecies of Isaiah. Two Vols. (21s.)
—— Commentary on Epistle to the Hebrews. Two Vols. (21s.)
—— A System of Biblical Psychology. One Vol. (12s.)
Döllinger—Hippolytus and Callistus; or, The Church of Rome: A.D. 200–250. One Vol. (7s. 6d.)
Dorner—A System of Christian Doctrine. Four Vols. (42s.)
—— History of the Development of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ. Five Vols. (52s. 6d.)
Ebrard—Commentary on the Epistles of St. John. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
—— The Gospel History. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
—— Apologetics. Three Vols. (31s. 6d.)
Ewald—Revelation: Its Nature and Record. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
Frank—System of Christian Certainty. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
Gebhardt—Doctrine of the Apocalypse. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
Gerlach—Commentary on the Pentateuch. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
Gieseler—Compendium of Ecclesiastical History. Four Vols. (42s.)
Godet—Commentary on St. Luke's Gospel. Two Vols. (21s.)
—— Commentary on St. John's Gospel. Three Vols. (31s. 6d.)
—— Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. Two Vols. (21s.)
—— Commentary on 1st Corinthians. Two Vols. (21s.)
Goebel—On the Parables. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
Hagenbach—History of the Reformation. Two Vols. (21s.)
—— History of Christian Doctrines. Three Vols. (31s. 6d.)
Harless—A System of Christian Ethics. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
Haupt—Commentary on the First Epistle of St. John. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
Havernick—General Introduction to the Old Testament. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
Hengstenberg—Christology of the Old Testament. Four Vols. (42s.)
—— Commentary on the Psalms. Three Vols. (33s.)
—— On the Book of Ecclesiastes, etc. etc. One Vol. (9s.)
—— Commentary on the Gospel of St. John. Two Vols. (21s.)
—— Commentary on Ezekiel. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
—— Dissertations on the Genuineness of Daniel, etc. One Vol. (12s.)
—— The Kingdom of God under the Old Covenant. Two Vols. (21s.)
Keil—Introduction to the Old Testament. Two Vols. (21s.)
—— Commentary on the Pentateuch. Three Vols. (31s. 6d.)
—— Commentary on Joshua, Judges, and Ruth. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
—— Commentary on the Books of Samuel. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
—— Commentary on the Books of Kings. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
—— Commentary on the Books of Chronicles. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
—— Commentary on Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
—— Commentary on Jeremiah and Lamentations. Two Vols. (21s.)
—— Commentary on Ezekiel. Two Vols. (21s.)
—— Commentary on the Book of Daniel. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
—— Commentary on the Minor Prophets. Two Vols. (21s.)
—— Biblical Archæology. Two Vols. (21s.)
Kurtz—History of the Old Covenant; or, Old Testament Dispensation. Three Vols. (31s. 6d.)
Lange—Commentary on the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark. Three Vols. (31s. 6d.)
—— Commentary on the Gospel of St. Luke. Two Vols. (18s.)
—— Commentary on the Gospel of St. John. Two Vols. (21s.)
Luthardt—Commentary on the Gospel of St. John. Three Vols. (31s. 6d.)
Macdonald—Introduction to the Pentateuch. Two Vols. (21s.)
Martensen—Christian Dogmatics. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
—— Christian Ethics. General—Social—Individual. Three Vols. (31s. 6d.)
Müller—The Christian Doctrine of Sin. Two Vols. (21s.)
Murphy—Commentary on the Psalms. *To count as Two Volumes.* One Vol. (12s.)
Neander—General History of the Christian Religion and Church. Nine Vols. (67s. 6d.)
Oehler—Biblical Theology of the Old Testament. Two Vols. (21s.)
Olshausen—Commentary on the Gospels and Acts. Four Vols. (42s.)
—— Commentary on Epistle to the Romans. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
—— Commentary on Epistles to the Corinthians. One Vol. (9s.)
—— Commentary on Philippians, Titus, and 1st Timothy. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
Orelli—Prophecy regarding Consummation of God's Kingdom. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
Philippi—Commentary on Epistle to Romans. Two Vols. (21s.)
Räbiger—Encyclopædia of Theology. Two Vols. (21s.)
Ritter—Comparative Geography of Palestine. Four Vols. (26s.)
Sartorius—The Doctrine of Divine Love. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
Schürer—The Jewish People in the Time of Christ. Division II. Three Vols. (10s. 6d. each.)
Shedd—History of Christian Doctrine. Two Vols. (21s.)
Steinmeyer—History of the Passion and Resurrection of our Lord. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
—— The Miracles of our Lord in relation to Modern Criticism. One Vol. (7s. 6d.)
Stier—The Words of the Lord Jesus. Eight Vols. (10s. 6d. per vol.)
—— The Words of the Risen Saviour, and Commentary on Epistle of St. James. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
—— The Words of the Apostles Expounded. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
Tholuck—Commentary on the Gospel of St. John. One Vol. (9s.)
Ullmann—Reformers before the Reformation. Two Vols. (21s.)
Weiss—Biblical Theology of the New Testament. Two Vols. (21s.)
—— The Life of Christ. Three Vols. (31s. 6d.)
Winer—Collection of the Confessions of Christendom. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)

Date Loaned

DATE DUE

BS
1174
.S3
v.2

813

UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY LIBRARY
3 0645 1001 1067 1